

By Mr. ROE of Maryland:

H. R. 6456. A bill to provide for an examination and survey to determine the advisability and feasibility of dredging Levering Creek at Ewell, Md., on Smith Island; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H. R. 6457. A bill to reduce taxation by conserving the assets of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6458. A bill to authorize the sale of British bonds in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 6459. A bill to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6460. A bill to authorize the furnishing of motor equipment to seriously disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 6461. A bill to include the Virgin Islands in certain titles of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 6462. A bill to provide for making certain War Department articles and equipment available for use at the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to be held in Boston, Mass., in September 1946; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 6463. A bill to provide for making certain War Department articles and equipment available for use at the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to be held in Boston, Mass., in September 1946; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 6464. A bill to amend section 108 of the act approved April 30, 1946 (Public, No. 370, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 6465. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Big South Fork River and its tributaries, in the State of Tennessee, for flood control, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 354. A joint resolution to provide for the designation of the Park River Dam and Reservoir project in Walsh County, N. Dak., as the Homme Reservoir and Dam; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 622. Resolution to investigate into the propaganda activities of the Arab League in this country; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Res. 623. Resolution requesting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make periodical reports to the House regarding premium payments made under section 11 of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6466. A bill for the relief of Veto (Nee) Roberts and her son, Philip Gordon Marais; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 6467. A bill for the relief of Harry V. Ball; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 6468. A bill for the relief of Joseph Fountain; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6469. A bill for the relief of the estates of Harold P. Stites and William A. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6470. A bill for the relief of Antonio Sorotas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6471. A bill to authorize the Soil Conservation Service Administrator to sell certain submarginal lands in Billings County, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 6472. A bill for the relief of John E. Peterson, James M. Hiller, Vivian Langemo, Floy Sibrie, and Ross Lee Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6473. A bill for the relief of William H. Powell and Loretta B. Powell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 6474. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hazel W. Macdonald; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 6475. A bill for the relief of the estates of William A. Miller and Harold P. Stites; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6476. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Whitehead, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1886. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of J. Carlton Hurley and other residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., requesting that Congress pass a resolution authorizing the President and the Secretary of Agriculture to issue directives preventing the use of grain for the manufacture of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1887. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Frank E. Stebbins and other residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., requesting that Congress pass a resolution authorizing the President and the Secretary of Agriculture to issue directives preventing the use of grain for the manufacture of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1888. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of J. R. Jones, Mexia, Tex., opposing tax exemption for co-ops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1889. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of workers of Columbia Machine Works, Inc., United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, Local No. 475, CIO, in support of the extension of OPA and against any crippling amendments; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1890. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the executive committee of United States Employment Service Employees, Local No. 968, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, Trenton, N. J., urging that appropriate action be taken to insure adequate financing for the full continuance and operation of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1891. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Theo P. Schubert and 508 other operating and nonoperating railroad employees, requesting the enactment of legislation by the Congress providing for the payment of pensions of \$150 a month to men retiring from railroad employment after 30 years' service or at 60 years with two-thirds of such pensions paid to the widow of such a man; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 17, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, without whose guidance our wisdom is but folly, keep us this day in serene sincerity of purpose with the seal of understanding charity upon our lips. Save us from being embittered by ingratitude, pettiness, or meanness, and from turning coward in the day of battle. May we be satisfied with nothing less than our best, however difficult and testing the duty before us. May the voice of the past warn us of paths which lead to national disaster, may the voice of the present call us to be prophets of good will in today's crisis, and may the voice of the future challenge us to a golden day when earth's dismal deserts shall blossom into glad-some gardens. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1946.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GEORGE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 16, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 15, 1946:

S. 1442. An act for the relief of George O. Weems; and

S. 1961. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Disabled American Veterans in the District of Columbia.

On May 16, 1946:

S. 842. An act for the relief of the Elmira Area Soaring Corp.; and

S. 2101. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, to permit the shipment of relief supplies.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5560. An act to fix the rate of postage on domestic air mail, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6335. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate until Tuesday evening.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as the members on the part of the Senate of the United States Princeton University Bicentennial Commission, established by Public Law 367, approved April 26, 1946.

The President pro tempore serves as ex officio under the terms of the resolution.

PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Orosi, Calif., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 599, to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in newspapers, periodicals, and motion pictures, and over the radio, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PROTEST AGAINST RESTORATION OF FOOD RATIONING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Lem Coffey, manager of the Service Supreme Groceries, Wichita, Kans., protesting against Mr. Bowles' suggestion that food rationing be restored. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICE SUPREME GROCERS CORP.,
Wichita, Kans., May 14, 1946.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

Subject: Food rationing and black market.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: We, as a group of grocers representing 72 retail stores of Wichita and surrounding territory, employing a combined force of approximately 300 employees, wish to voice our protest against Mr. Bowles' suggestion that food rationing be restored.

We believe that this is unnecessary and simply a means for OPA perpetuating themselves in office and working an undue hardship on the retail merchant and all other distributors of food.

Also, we believe that if all restrictions and price controls were lifted from the meat-

packing industry that the problem of meat shortage would automatically correct itself. The retail merchant in this territory is confronted with a serious problem in combating the black market, which seems to be flourishing just outside of the city limits of Wichita. This is a serious situation confronting the legitimate retailer who is unwilling to buy meat on the black market.

We sincerely hope that you will use your influence to correct this situation.

Yours very truly,

LEM L. COFFEY,
Manager.

RESOLUTIONS OF YOUNG REPUBLICANS OF FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, EMPORIA, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by the Young Republicans of the Fourth Congressional District at their annual meeting held at Emporia, Kans., on May 5, opposing legislation which extends price control in this country for an unlimited length of time; also a resolution urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would give enlisted men the same rights of terminal leave pay as that enjoyed by officers of the armed forces. I ask unanimous consent to have these resolutions printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolutions will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Whereas it is brought to the attention of the Fourth District Young Republican meeting at Emporia, Kans., on the fifth day of May, 1946, that legislation extending the OPA is before the Congress of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Young Republicans of the Fourth District go on record as opposing legislation tending to extend price controls in this country for an unlimited length of time.

"That when items reach a point in production where their removal from price control would not incur danger of inflation, they be removed from price control.

"That amendments which tend to relieve gross inequities in price structure and that would further encourage increased production of commodities needed by consumers of this country be incorporated in any legislation affecting extension of OPA.

"DEL ROSKAM,
"Chairman.

"Attest:

"W. G. LEONARD,
"Secretary."

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Be it resolved by the Young Republicans of the Fourth Congressional District in convention assembled, That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact legislation which would give to enlisted men the same rights and privileges of terminal leave pay as that enjoyed by officers of the armed forces.

"DEL ROSKAM,
"Chairman.

"Attest:

"W. G. LEONARD,
"Secretary."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1809. A bill to revive and reenact and amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to construct, main-

tain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near the city of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., to a point opposite thereto in the county of Union, State of Kentucky," approved July 18, 1939; without amendment (Rept. No. 1354).

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1922. A bill to revive and reenact the act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Department of South Carolina to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River, at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C., approved August 18, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 1355);

S. 1983. A bill authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Ind.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1356);

S. 1984. A bill authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Wabash River near Mount Vernon, Ind.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1357);

H. R. 5187. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across New River near Radford, Montgomery County, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1358);

H. R. 5357. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River, at a point between the Boroughs of Elizabeth, in Elizabeth Township, and West Elizabeth, in Jefferson Township, in the county of Allegheny, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 1359); and

H. R. 5387. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River between the Borough of Belle Vernon, Fayette County, Pa., and the Borough of Speers, Washington County, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1360).

By Mr. KNOWLAND, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 3565. A bill to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge; with amendments (Rept. No. 1362).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2209. A bill for the relief of the estates of William A. Miller and Harold P. Stites; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2210. A bill to provide for the return of certain securities to the Philippine Commonwealth Government; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 2211. A bill for the relief of Marie Volpe, administratrix of the estate of Leonard R. Volpe, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2212. A bill for the relief of William D. Brooks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 2213. A bill to extend to January 1, 1948, the time within which the States may construct or acquire toll bridges and make them free bridges, securing reimbursement from Federal-aid road funds for a part of the cost

of constructing or acquiring such bridges; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 2214. A bill for the relief of Marvin Sachwitz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 2215. A bill to abolish the Office of Price Administration and to transfer certain of its functions to the Secretary of Agriculture and the National Housing Administrator; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2216. A bill for the relief of Steve Zevas; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 2217. A bill to authorize the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to accept reenlistments and extension of enlistments of certain individuals for duty at lifeboat stations during the year 1946; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution naming the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the South Branch of the Park River in North Dakota the "Homme Dam and Reservoir"; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution extending for 7 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2028) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE BUSINESSMAN AND CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of an article entitled "The Businessman and Congress," written by him for the May, 1946, issue of Commerce magazine which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SURPLUS-PROPERTY SCANDAL—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK SUN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Sun of May 16, 1946, entitled "Congress Investigates Scandal in Sale of \$100,000,000 War Goods," written by Phelps Adams, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHOULD PRICE CONTROL BE CONTINUED?—DEBATE BETWEEN MERRYLE STANLEY RUKEYSER AND SAMUEL W. LEVITTIES

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio discussion on the "Wake Up America" quiz-debate on the subject Should Price Control Be Continued? participated in by Merryle Stanley Rukeyser and Samuel W. Levitties on April 30, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TAKE IT EASY PROGRAM FOR ACCIDENT PREVENTION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by the American Automobile Association to the President of the United States, the President's answer, and a statement by the American Automobile Association, respecting the Take It Easy program for accident prevention, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIAL SECURITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Role of Social Security in the Future of America," delivered by Senator MURRAY at the West Virginia University convocation on May 8, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

HUMAN RIGHTS IN A WORLD ORDER—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Human Rights in a World Order," delivered by Senator MURRAY before the Committee of Catholics for Human Rights, in New York City on May 10, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT NEWS

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Seaway Opponent Is Far From the Truth," from the Detroit (Mich.) News of May 10, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEDIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4908) to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], as modified, as a substitute for section 8 of the committee amendment on page 28.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] has the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin; but for what purpose, may I ask?

Mr. WILEY. I desire to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Sun in relation to the surplus property scandal. I also desire to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article I wrote for the May 1946 issue of the Commerce magazine, and I wish further to ask unanimous consent to offer to the pending bill an amendment to establish compulsory arbitration in utilities and vital Nation-wide industries in order to protect the public interest and to ask that the amendment be printed in the RECORD, that it be printed in the usual form, and lie upon the table, and in connection therewith I ask that I may be permitted to speak 3 minutes in explanation of the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, which I am not going to do in this instance, I want to say that I deplore the practice that has

grown up here of Senators who have the floor yielding to other Senators to make speeches, whether on the subject under debate or on other subjects. It is a vicious practice; it is a violation of the rules, and any Senator who does it automatically loses the floor, if any other Senator makes the point of order. It ought not to be indulged in. I make this statement because I am going to cooperate with other Senators in an effort to break up the practice of the Senator who has the floor farming it out, as we call it, to other Senators. It has been done during the last month to an extent that I have never before observed in the Senate. It ought not to be indulged in. I am not going to object to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin, but I feel that I ought to make the statement I have made for the future.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending bill to establish compulsory arbitration in utilities and vital Nation-wide industries in order to protect the public interest.

This amendment is integrated with other amendments prepared by a group of minority Senators to the Case bill, H. R. 4908.

I have on countless occasions in past years suggested on the floor of the Senate that nothing short of compulsory arbitration machinery would save this country from the paralysis of ruinous strikes such as we are now experiencing. I feel now that with the strike crisis acute, with a Nation-wide railroad strike threatening tomorrow, a resumed coal strike looming ahead, a maritime strike and so on, and with this legislation long overdue, it is imperative that this body enact now some such legislation as I am introducing.

This amendment follows the general pattern of the accepted procedures of the Railway Labor Act, except that it makes arbitration compulsory rather than merely voluntary. I may say, too, that the amendment profits from several of the valuable elements incorporated in the industrial relations bill, S. 1171, introduced by the Senators from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and our former colleague from Ohio, Mr. Burton.

REASONS FOR AMENDMENT

I should like now to make certain points regarding this amendment:

First. Mere mediation and voluntary arbitration machinery are not enough to save America from strike chaos. Of course, such machinery must and should be used to the fullest extent. The compulsory arbitration which I now propose would go into effect only after the previous machinery had been fully exhausted.

I believe that it is inconceivable, however, that we should rest our hopes in mere "chance machinery" such as mediation and voluntary arbitration. I believe that a Nation which can and did take 16,000,000 men from its farms, its schools and its industries and place them

in the uniform of our country, can and should enforce compulsory arbitration in order to save the very values for which those men sacrificed so much.

I want to point out that:

(A) We are living in an atomic age when attack can come in a matter of minutes from rockets and guided missiles, and that, therefore, it is essential that our industrial machinery be preserved from an internal Pearl Harbor such as a disastrous strike.

(B) We are living in an economically complex age when every part of our economy is interdependent with every other part and is particularly dependent on such vital services as electricity, transportation, communications, and so forth.

(C) We are living in a revolutionary age in which we are contesting the worldwide forces of communism, dedicated to the proposition that the State must be all-powerful and that the individual is of no account.

In our own country the Reds and Pinks and other radicals are up to their ears, fomenting disunity and discontent in the ranks of labor and in the public and in promoting strikes.

In view of all this, it is inconceivable that we should allow ourselves to engage in mere wishful thinking and mere hopes that strikes will be settled voluntarily.

Second. No one regrets more than I the necessity for compulsion. I would infinitely prefer that right reason would prevail and that both labor and management would be free to engage in voluntary mediation and arbitration. But right reason does not always prevail as has been proven so many times in the past when labor leaders and men of management have forgotten their obligation to the public interest.

Third. I believe that if Congress does not enact compulsory arbitration machinery now, then Congress and the American people will have great cause to regret that decision in the months and the years to come.

America has been burnt, not once, but many times, by relying on wishful thinking and chance machinery to settle labor disputes. Perhaps she must be burnt still more before Congress has enough guts to enact such machinery as I propose. I deeply regret that my beloved country should have to undergo another burning in the fire of ruinous strikes, and that is why I am proposing this legislation now in the face of the very obvious opposition to it on the part of irresponsible labor bosses and, yes, of some irresponsible management bosses.

I ask that the amendment submitted by me be printed in the RECORD, printed in the usual form and lie on the table, and that a statement explanatory of the amendment may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed in the RECORD, printed in the usual form, and lie on the table, and the explanatory statement

submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin will also be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. WILEY to the bill (H. R. 4908) to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes, is as follows:

On page 19, line 14, strike the period at the end thereof, insert a comma, and add the following: "except as specifically provided."

On page 24, line 22, strike the period after the word "act" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "except as otherwise provided by the provisions of this act relative to compulsory arbitration."

At the proper place in the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. —. (a) When the Federal Mediation Board finds and determines that a labor dispute affecting commerce, which is not settled or adjusted under other provisions of this act, or under the Railway Labor Act, as amended, if subject thereto, (1) involves an industry engaged in the production of goods or services which are essential to the public health, safety, or security, or to the normal functioning of the national economy, or which are furnished by a public utility whose rates are fixed by governmental agency, State or Federal, and (2) threatens or has resulted in such interruption of the furnishing of such goods and services as will endanger the public health, safety, or security in the Nation as a whole or any part thereof, or as will so substantially interrupt commerce as seriously to disrupt the functioning of the national economy, or in the case of public utilities as will substantially interrupt the furnishing of an essential monopolized service, then the Board shall so notify the President. Upon receipt of such notification, the President is authorized to require submittal of the dispute to arbitration by a board of seven persons (or, if the parties so stipulate, three persons).

"(b) Within 20 days after notice from the President to the parties to the dispute or their representatives that the dispute shall be submitted to arbitration, it shall be the duty of the parties and their representatives to enter into an arbitration agreement covering all the questions involved in the unsettled controversy. The parties shall have no power to withdraw questions submitted or to terminate the arbitration except upon written settlement of such questions or of the controversy, respectively, filed with the board of arbitration. Such settlements shall be effective for at least 6 months from the date thereof. In case of failure or refusal of the parties to execute such an arbitration agreement, the Board shall name the arbitrators and shall present to the board of arbitration a submission in behalf of the parties which shall conform as nearly as may be to the requirements for an arbitration agreement. Neither a board of arbitration named pursuant to the arbitration agreement nor a board of arbitration appointed by the Federal Mediation Board shall be limited or restrained in the exercise of its power to make a binding award by the failure or refusal of any party, or of all parties, to participate in the proceedings.

"(c) The provisions of section 7 second through section 9 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (U. S. Code, title 45, secs. 157 second through sec. 159) shall govern arbitration conducted under this section to the extent that such provisions are not inconsistent with this section. Where used in the aforesaid sections of the Railway Labor Act, for the purposes of this section the term 'carrier or carriers' shall mean the employer or employers parties to the dispute and/or their representatives; the term 'employees' shall mean the employees parties to the dispute and/or their representatives; the term

'board of arbitration' shall mean such boards established under this section; the term 'Mediation Board' shall mean the Federal Mediation Board; and the term 'chapter' or 'act' shall mean this section.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, for the purposes of this section:

"(1) A board of arbitration shall have the power to grant or deny in whole or in part the relief sought by any parties on any question submitted.

"(2) The provisions of section 7 (f) of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (U. S. Code, title 45, sec. 157 (f)) relating to filing the award with the Interstate Commerce Commission and to the effect of such award on the powers and duties of the Commission, for the purposes of this section shall be applicable only to awards in proceedings under this section to which carriers subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission are parties: *Provided, however*, That in all proceedings under this section involving carriers or public utilities whose rates are fixed by governmental agency, a certified copy of the award shall also be furnished to such agency and no such award shall be construed to diminish the powers and duties of such agency: *Provided, further*, That in the case of any award which grants an increase in wages or salaries, a copy of the proposed award, together with copies of the papers and proceedings and a transcript of the evidence taken at the hearings, all certified under the hands of at least a majority of the arbitrators, shall, before the award is filed for judgment thereon, be furnished to the Stabilization Administrator while such office exists, and a certified copy of such proposed award shall also be furnished the parties. The Stabilization Administrator, if in his judgment such action is necessary to prevent wage or salary increases inconsistent with the purposes of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, shall have the authority to require by directive that the board of arbitration reduce its award to such maximum increases as in his judgment are consistent with the purposes of said act. Failure on the part of the Stabilization Administrator to exercise such authority within 15 days after the receipt of the award, papers, proceedings, and transcript and to issue such directive to the board of arbitration shall be deemed approval of such increase for all purposes under the stabilization laws and Executive orders and regulations issued thereunder. As soon as practicable after receipt of the directive from the Stabilization Administrator the board of arbitration shall amend its proposed award accordingly and issue the award so amended as a final award and the same procedural and substantive provisions shall apply thereto as to any award under this section, except that no award shall be held not to comply with the stipulations of the agreement to arbitrate or of the submission in behalf of the parties by the Federal Mediation Board because of the time consumed in conforming to this proviso or because the award grants or denies wage or salary increases in conformity with the directive of the Stabilization Administrator.

"(3) In the case of an arbitration agreement providing for a board of seven arbitrators the parties shall choose four and the arbitrators or the Federal Mediation Board, as the case may be, shall name three, all in the manner provided in section 7 second (b) of the Railway Labor Act aforesaid.

"(e) If an award is set aside in whole or in part and the parties do not agree upon a judgment to dispose of the subject matter of the controversy, the Federal Mediation Board shall reinvestigate the matter. If it makes the findings described in subsection (a) of this section, it shall so notify the President. The President is then authorized to require

resubmittal of the matters in dispute to arbitration pursuant to the provisions of this section and further to require that no person who was a member of the previous board of arbitration shall serve on the new board.

"(f) The duties of employers and employees and their representatives involved in the dispute, and the penalties for breach thereof, as set forth in section 3 of this act, shall continue from the date of the requirement of submittal to arbitration until the entry of final judgment upon an award, or until termination of the proceeding by written settlement, as the case may be. Any such settlement, as well as settlement of particular questions by agreement of the parties at any stage of the proceedings, shall be enforceable under the provisions of this act relating to enforcement of collective-bargaining contracts.

"(g) Unless in the arbitration agreement the parties stipulate for a longer period, an award shall continue in force for 6 months from the entry of final judgment thereon. During such period it shall be the duty of the employers and employees and their representatives involved in the dispute to adhere to the terms of the award and to refrain from strikes, lock-outs, and concerted slow-downs of production. Section 3, subsections (c), (d), and (e) of this act shall exclusively govern any breach of such duties.

"(h) Impeachment of awards under this section, provided for by reference, shall be the exclusive method of judicial review thereof."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF SENATOR
WILEY'S AMENDMENT TO CASE BILL

INTRODUCTION

The premises of the proposed compulsory arbitration amendment are three.

First, labor disputes of the character described in subsection (a) should not be permitted to interrupt production because the damage to the public weal outweighs the possible gains to either of the parties obtainable by strike or lock-out.

Second, the compulsory features should not hamper the freedom of the parties to settle their dispute by negotiation.

Third, there should be a time limit on any award or settlement achieved by or during compulsory arbitration. In light of these premises such an act must provide for the maintenance of the status quo ante pending arbitration, for full freedom during arbitration to settle controversies by agreements, which will be effective for some minimum period of time, and for a time limit upon the award.

PROVISIONS

This amendment provides that upon the conditions described in subsection (a) the President may require the parties to submit to arbitration. The parties have 20 days to draw up an agreement to arbitrate covering all the issues, but if they fail or refuse to do so, the mediation board may appoint arbitrators and execute a submission on behalf of the parties, subsection (b).

From the date of requirement of submittal to arbitration to the entry of final judgment upon an award, the same duties to restore the status quo and to refrain from strikes, lock-outs, and slow-downs, as are applicable in the Ball-Taft-Smith cooling-off period amendment to section 3 of the committee bill apply to the parties, subsection (f). These provisions are designed to maintain production.

Subsection (b) leaves the parties free to settle all or any part of their dispute during proceedings. Such settlements must be effective for 6 months. This is to prevent collusive settlements to defeat the arbitration and resume industrial warfare.

Subsection (f) makes such settlements enforceable as collective bargaining contracts under the provisions of the Ball-Taft-Smith amendment relating thereto. It is to be noted that all provisions of other proposed amendments made applicable to this section are merely incorporated by reference.

The amendment places a 6 months limit on the duration of the award after judgment thereon unless the parties agree to a larger period, subsection (g). This is the same period that any settlement is to remain in effect, subsection (b). Since neither settlement under the pressure of arbitration proceedings nor the award itself can be considered wholly voluntary, and since conditions in the industry may change, a time limit of 6 months seemed fair.

The arbitration provisions of the Railway Labor Act, incorporated by reference, guide the arbitration and judicial proceedings on the award, so far as such provisions are not inconsistent with the amendment. The voluntary submittal, mutual right to revoke, and mutual freedom to withdraw questions, as given by the Railway Labor Act, are excised or modified for the purposes of this amendment. Under the Railway Labor Act judgment on award is enforceable as any judgment. Under this amendment (subsection (g)), violation of the award, strikes, lock-outs, and slow-downs, deprive employees of certain rights under the National Labor Relations Act or as to employers, if they are the violators, constitute an unfair labor practice under such act. These provisions are incorporated by reference to the cooling-off amendment to section 3, above-mentioned. This is consistent with the general enforcement provisions of other amendments. Since Congress created the rights under the National Labor Relations Act, it is believed that it can take them away altogether, and that power includes the power to modify them.

No involuntary servitude section appears because the proposed amendment to section 3 of the committee bill contains such a provision applicable to the whole act and the provisions of the Railway Labor Act applicable to this section do also (45 U. S. C. sec. 159, eighth).

Section (d) (2) provides for a review of an award increasing wages or salaries by the Stabilization Administrator while such office exists. The purpose is obvious.

If the award is set aside in whole or part, the dispute is still unsettled. Therefore, subsection (e) provides for reinvestigation by the Mediation Board and resubmittal to arbitration if the President so desires upon proper findings by the Board. The parties can obviate this by agreeing to a judgment disposing of the subject matter of the controversy if they so desire.

The exclusive review provided in subsection (h) is limited to impeachment on grounds of fraud, nonconformity with the act, and nonconformity with the submission to arbitration in order to assure parties a fair determination and at the same time prevent the burdening of courts with all the complex issues already decided by the award.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho for his courtesy in yielding to me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me for the purpose of putting something in the RECORD?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am sorry, but, after the statement of the majority leader, I do not feel that I should yield the floor further. I certainly have no desire to delay the business of the Senate, but it

is felt by some that the practice of yielding the floor to other Senators is not proper. I certainly want to yield, but under the circumstances I do not think I should.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Idaho that I was not objecting to insertions in the RECORD or the introduction of bills, but I do object to having speeches made in the time of another Senator who has the floor. No time is saved, for the same speeches would probably be made anyway. I think the rule as to yielding for a speech should be observed, but I do not object to the insertions in the RECORD or the introduction of bills or other routine matters.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say to the majority leader that the Senator from Wisconsin told me he would be very brief; otherwise, I would not have yielded to him in the first instance.

Under the circumstances I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

(Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio discussion on the subject Should Price Control Be Continued, which appears in the Appendix.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an extraordinary circumstance, which has come to pass within the last 10 days. It is the fact that the tragic and deplorable plight of the American coal miner and his dependents has finally succeeded in commanding the attention of the American public. The iron curtain, which has been down so long over one of the most miserable phases of existence in the United States, now has been lifted. The lame, the halt, and the blind parade before our eyes.

Were there an orchestral accompaniment, it would be a funeral dirge. The macabre dancers are illness, privation, and death.

We recoil in horror from the scene. Can such things be in the United States? May God forgive us, but they are.

Yet, now that we are witnessing them, what are we going to do about them? The United States does many things for many peoples. Starvation in Europe? Send food. Starvation in Asia? Send food. Financing for the British Empire? Loan her the money. Epidemic in India? Rush doctors and medicines. Earthquakes or other cataclysms—any place? Send help, clothing, food, the means of shelter. There never has been an instance wherein the great heart of America has failed to respond when it learned of suffering and disaster. And it should respond, because we are the fortunate possessors of the most bountiful land in the world.

All right, the conspiracy of silence against the coal miner—the evil fruit of long years of man's inhumanity to man—has come to an end. The American coal miner stands before us, grimy faced and toll worn, underpaid, poorly nourished, horribly housed.

He descends into the blackness of the earth, and all the hazards this connotes, so our homes may be warm, our hearths reflect cheer, and our industries func-

tion. And what does he get out of it—for himself, his wife, and his children?

We know the answer now. We have had it in words and in pictures in three of the newspapers in the Nation's capital. They are the Washington Times-Herald, the Washington Star, and the Washington Post.

I wish to express my appreciation to Mrs. Eleanor Patterson, the editor of the Times-Herald, for dispatching a reporter and photographer to Kenvir, Ky., and for the stark and grim revelations of life in a mining town which resulted from her action.

I wish also to thank Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, the wife of the publisher of the Washington Post, for her first-hand reporting of conditions in the coal fields.

I desire likewise to pay tribute to Mr. James Y. Newton, of the Washington Star, for his admirable work in bringing to the public the real issues of the coal strike.

There is no need for me to expatiate upon the social degradation that is the unmerited lot of 600,000 American coal miners and their 3,500,000 dependents. The facts are before us.

If the Congress of the United States could meet but for a single day in Kenvir, Ky., the shocking indecency toward and mistreatment of the American coal miner would end forever.

Mr. President, yesterday I was criticized for reading various articles and statements rather than talking extemporaneously. I do not profess to be an expert on very many subjects, and therefore if I can quote from experts I feel that the testimony should have more validity than if I stood here and expressed offhand opinions of my own. For that reason I expect to continue for a short time only, and I shall read at this point a pamphlet published by James F. Lincoln, president of the Lincoln Electric Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, entitled "Intelligent Selfishness and Manufacturing." This is very pertinent to the subject in hand, the question of labor legislation, because it outlines the policies followed by the Lincoln Electric Co., and the very successful labor relations which have resulted from those policies. I read:

INTELLIGENT SELFISHNESS AND MANUFACTURING

Great as American industry is, it leaves largely untapped its great resources, the productive power, initiative, and intelligence latent in every person. The Prophet states it: "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hand." That conception is a far cry from the normal evaluation of man by his contemporaries. Truly man is so made but our industrial does not now fully develop these abilities.

There have been many who have guessed what the result would be if a large, intelligently led, enthusiastic organization should use the powers latent in all the individuals to a common end. What would happen when all are equally anxious to produce a product at the lowest possible cost? What would happen when all want to make the wages of all workers, from sweeper to manager, a maximum? What would happen when all want to make the company profitable since it is largely owned by the workers in it?

This cannot be done by human beings except by the exploitation of the driving force fundamental in all of us, namely, selfishness. Selfishness has a bad reputation

but that is because of a narrow conception as to what it really is. No program involving the human race developed as it has been through the ages on the concept of "survival of the fittest" can be founded on any other principle than selfishness. The only necessary corollary to this principle to make it attractive, helpful, and satisfying to all concerned is to make this selfishness intelligent. The greatest heights we attain as humans—patriotism, parenthood, and friendship—are all based on this same human trait—selfishness. The result which can occur when this incentive is tapped can be illustrated by the following example:

The Lincoln Electric Co., of Cleveland, was started by one man with a capital of \$150 of borrowed money in 1896 and has had no outside capital since. The company has tried to follow the principle of appealing to the intelligent selfishness of the worker, the manager, and the investor. It has gone along its unique path for a long enough time so that its results are proven. There is sufficient history back of the facts so that no error can be made in appraising the outcome. The results are:

(a) Lincoln workers, at least in the factory, are the highest paid employees in industry anywhere in the world.

(b) Lincoln workers produce more per hour than any organization making a comparable product in the world.

(c) Lincoln selling prices are less than those of any company making a comparable product. Obviously, companies making specifically competing products must sell at the same price if they are to remain competitors.

(d) Lincoln stockholders have never missed a dividend since the first payment was made in 1918.

(e) The Lincoln Electric Co. does approximately half of the total arc welding business of the United States and more than a quarter of all the arc welding business of the world.

(f) Practically speaking there is no labor turnover.

(g) There is no labor union.

Following is the story of this company's methods used to produce these results:

1914: An advisory board was formed. The basic job of this board is the developing of the normally unused abilities inherent in the organization. In order to bring the intelligence of all people in the organization to bear on the subject this board was chosen from the entire personnel of the plant. This was done by electing one man from each department by the vote of all the people in such department. The foremen in the plant also elected a representative foreman from their group. These men with the plant superintendent and president (who acts as chairman) constitute the advisory board. This board has authority over all matters affecting the man and shop operations. They are the board of directors for the plant.

This is what that board did from 1914, when formed, to date:

1914: Decreased the hours of work from 55 (then standard) to 50, with a 10-percent increase in wage rates. The result of this action was to increase efficiency so that the cost per piece was definitely reduced.

1914: Installed a piecework plan which has been satisfactory to all concerned (both workers and management), without change of this plan to date. The rates are guaranteed by the company after being set by an expert time-study man who has been trained in that department. The worker, however, has a right to eliminate the price by challenge. When this is done the time-study man runs the job himself for a day. Whatever his earnings are, whether higher or lower, is the new price. This price is subject to the same rules as the first one, however. The company can change the price

only by changing the method, design, or tooling, thus making it a new job.

1915: Insured the lives of all workers for the equivalent of a year's wages at no cost to the worker.

1918: Tried bonus payment, which was not successful at that time. This was the "silk-shirt era." The amount of this bonus was not a large percentage of the year's wages although it was half of the dividend declared that year. Also, the mutual understanding between management and men which longer experience developed was not then present.

1923: Adopted the policy of vacation of all workers with pay, shutting down the entire factory for this purpose the second and third weeks of August each year. This was a radical departure at that time although it has become more common in recent years.

1925: Sold stock of the company to the employees who desired it, providing the workers had been continuously employed for 1 year. More than half of the normal workers are stockholders. They largely own their own plant.

1929: Established a suggestion system. Suggestions which were accepted, made by any man outside of engineers, time-study men, and others who from the nature of their jobs were responsible for improvement in methods or design, were rewarded in cash. The amount of this award was half of the net estimated saving for the first year of use after acceptance. This plan not only resulted in many good ideas, but it also kept those executives primarily responsible for such progress on their toes.

I may say at this point, Mr. President, that my own experience in a war plant shortly before coming to the United States Senate certainly leads me to believe that the idea of urging the workers to try to find new and better and more efficient ways of carrying on production in a factory should be a good one. In the factory where I worked there was no such program in effect. Frequently I saw operations that could have been shortened immeasurably. For instance, the Army, the Navy, or the Maritime Commission would give the plant a job consisting of the making of a great number of the same article. For the manufacture of the articles, we could have taken a day or two or three and made jigs; that is, frames in which to fit the articles, and then have welded them together just as fast as we could have thrown them into the frames, and could have turned out the whole job in a week or 2 weeks. As it was, no one was encouraged to devise a method to shorten the process. As I have stated before on the floor of the Senate, it was a cost-plus factory. So each article was measured and welded together, and thus the job, which could have been completed in a week or 10 days, would require 2 or 3 months. It was very disheartening. After a while no one tried to introduce improvements. One got to feeling after a while, "What is the use? They do not care whether the work is done efficiently or not. Why should I break my neck to try to speed up the work when we receive no encouragement to do so? If they would simply let us use a little horse sense we could complete the job very quickly."

Mr. President, when businessmen come before the Committee on Banking and Currency and criticize OPA for not using horse sense, my mind goes back to my experience in the war factory.

I continue reading from the pamphlet published by the Lincoln Electric Co.:

1934: Paid the second bonus which started the present bonus plan. This new plan was more workable than that of 1918 and has thoroughly succeeded. This second bonus was paid after the slump of 1929 to 1934 and was perhaps much more attractive because of that. In any case, it had a profound effect and resulted in greatly increased production, interest, and cooperation. These bonuses are based on the success of the company and are distributed on the basis of value of the man to the company for that year. The decision as to division of bonus is made by the president who alone, of all the personnel, gets no part of the money.

1936: Installed an annuity plan so that all faithful workers may be retired with pay when their working life is over. This results in not only rewarding the faithful employee but eliminates him from the possibility of accident which his failing powers may introduce.

1941: Installed a trust-fund plan for the workers.

1914-42: Handled the countless problems which arise in any operation as involved as a large manufacturing plant.

The results of these acts in total are manifold. If they did not increase production at least as much as their cost they would have been impossible. It must be seen in action to believe how great the result can be. No one otherwise can understand the advance that can be made when a man works in his own company, for his own benefit, and with his full enthusiasm.

The following graphs will show what the results of these policies have been.

The booklet contains graphs. Of course, they cannot be printed, so I will turn to the end of the booklet and read from the part headed "Suggestions":

Perhaps the following comments may be valuable in helping others to put in the same or a better method of arousing the intelligent selfishness of their own workers:

1. Management must be able to lead the organization in the direction of more efficient methods as fast as the method can be absorbed by the organization. This will be found to be the chief difficulty in most plants.

2. Management and men are "fellow workers." Neither is superior but each is responsible for their part in the result. Of course, management's direction is unquestioned and enthusiastically followed.

Of course we understand that in this case management includes representatives of labor.

Consequently, management must be made up of the best managerial ability in the organization. When a man with new managerial ability arises he is recognized. When one who is a manager slips he is eliminated. Accomplishing the elimination may give some trouble both in understanding and in doing in some organizations. Management must be able to stand on its record and be accepted by all the workers as being fair, able, and intelligent.

Can it be said that the operators of the coal mines are fair and intelligent, when we see pictures in the newspapers of the miserable housing conditions suffered by workers in the coal mines? Certainly such conditions are not calculated to get the best efforts and cooperation out of a worker.

3. A factory worker cannot express his ideas as well as a trained man of the world but he has them just the same. Management must be able to see, select, grade, and apply these ideas accurately and fairly.

4. The goal of the organization must be this—to make a better and better product to be sold at a lower and lower price.

As I pointed out yesterday, Mr. President, this does not happen in a great many cases. It may have happened in the case of the Lincoln Electric Co. In 1929 production efficiency had increased, but, instead of passing the savings on to the consumers in lower prices, management raised the prices, and the consumers did not have the money to buy the goods. Inventories accumulated, and a breakdown resulted. I predict, Mr. President, that the very same thing is going to happen again. Possibly within two years, and at the outside within five years, the American economy will collapse because of this same procedure—an increase in efficiency of the workers and disinclination or refusal on the part of the managerial end of our production machine to lower prices or increase wages. They could increase wages so that the workers could buy the goods, or they could lower prices so that the workers could buy more goods with their existing pay checks. But they will not do it. They have insisted on price increases in every case in which the workers received a wage increase.

In the questionnaire sent out by former Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, to the Republican rank and file throughout the country he asks, "How are we going to bring wages and the cost of living into balance again?" The cost of living has risen 33 percent, and workers' wages have increased only 15 percent. In other words, prices are going up faster than wages. Who else, may I ask, would get the 18-percent margin except the owners of the factory? So the same thing is happening again.

We can keep our economic machine going for a while because of the pent-up purchasing power that the common people have accumulated during the war, but that will not last forever. As soon as automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, and many other durable articles start coming off the production lines in great numbers the reserve purchasing power will disappear and current purchasing power will not be equal to production, and our economy will collapse.

Profit cannot be the goal. Profit must be a byproduct. That is a state of mind and a philosophy. Actually, an organization doing this job as it can be done will make large profits which must be properly divided between user, worker, and stockholder. That takes ability and character.

5. It must be kept in mind at all times that this is a natural working out of our inherent selfishness. The only difference between the Lincoln Electric Co. and the usual industry is that in this case the selfishness is more nearly intelligent. A sneak thief is selfish but not intelligent. The civil war called collective bargaining is selfish but not intelligent. The exploiting of workmen is selfish but not intelligent. The practice of raising prices in a seller's market is selfish but not intelligent. The charging of "all the traffic will bear" is selfish but not intelligent. War is selfish but not intelligent. The only difference between these acts and the program explained herein is that these acts are stupidly selfish and the activities outlined herein are intelligently selfish.

When we as a Nation adopt this principle of intelligent selfishness into our philosophy of life and industry we will have stopped unemployment of the employable, stopped poverty for the able-bodied, and, what is more, we will have gone far toward the elimination of misery no matter how caused.

Mr. President, this pamphlet is very pertinent to the discussion in hand. I am convinced that we cannot enact legislation which will outlaw strikes. We cannot make the miners or any other workers go back to work unless they have conditions which are satisfactory to them. It seems to me that until our industrialists have this intelligent selfishness and take the workers into the business and give them an interest in the business, we are bound to have disputes. I am opposed to any legislation calculated to make it possible to bring laborers or their unions into the courts.

I should like to read an excerpt from a book entitled "Cartels," written by Wendell Berge, and then I shall conclude.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to read a letter to the Senator and ask for his comments on it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. This morning I received a copy of a letter from a vegetable packing company in California. The letter is a page and a half long. If the Senator will indulge me while I read it to him, I should be glad to have his comments on it. The letter is self-explanatory. The letter begins "Dear Ed." It is written to a citizen of Iowa, who forwarded it to me, and reads as follows:

DEAR ED: The jurisdictional strife between the AFL and the CIO finally came to a climax last Friday morning when the CIO placed a picket line around our cannery and property with some 400 pickets and goons who blockaded the plant. The only three people who were legally let into the plant were Frank, Dave, and myself. Fired by loyalty and indignation, some of our key employees, along with the majority of our office help, finally managed to get in over the back fence, but not until we had had some violence at the front gate. One of the thugs took a poke at Dave and gave him a beautiful black eye, and two of our office employees were ruffled up very badly before the sheriff and his deputies got here. We are really shut down now.

In order to review the situation for you a little, last fall when most of the canneries were at the minimum of production and employment, the CIO took a vote, and won the cannery election. However, the AFL had it reviewed, and the National Labor Relations Board canceled the election the first part of August when the peak number of cannery employees were on the job. There has been strife between the two unions ever since.

As you remember, during the spinach pack we wrote you a letter saying that we had a ghost picket at the gate placed there by the AFL teamsters to keep their trucks from coming through. We got over that by having the farmers drive their own trucks in the plant, and the employees stayed on the job.

The California Processors and Growers, of which we are members along with 62 other canners, held a meeting at which it was decided the right thing to do was to make an agreement with the AFL, with whom we were signed up before the election until the election ordered by the NLRB could be held in August. At the meeting it was stated there would be no pressure brought to bear

upon the CIO members to sign with the AFL on clearance cards, and they could go on working just the same as the AFL workers. However, the agreement stated that the new employees coming into the plant should sign up with the AFL. This stipulation, I suppose, irritated the leaders of the CIO, who started closing down plants 3 weeks ago. They closed Richmond Chase here in Stockton; Libby, McNeill & Libby, in Sacramento; and us last Friday. It is their policy to close down all the canneries before they will start negotiations.

Now, mind you, there is nothing on our part we can do to stop this picket line. We were beginning our pea pack, the finest quality of California peas ever grown, and would have reached the peak either Friday or Saturday of last week. That pack is now gone. We had hopes of getting into the asparagus pack, and, by the way, had 1,100 boxes of asparagus on the floor ready to be canned Friday morning, which was a total of 2½ days of cutting in the field. This, along with all the peas that were vined at night, were a total loss.

There will be no shipment, nor any business whatsoever transacted while this strike is on. However, the CIO picket line yielded a point this morning when they allowed the keymen in the plant and our office force to come through the gate after we had a meeting here at the plant at 9 o'clock. In this land of plenty, and with crops ahead of us which look like the largest in the history of California, and starving people in the world, we people who want to do the right thing are run by organizations such as the one out in front of our plant; and no law in America will help us do something about it. Will advise you when something more materializes.

The question I should like to ask the Senator—and I ask it without any hostility toward the right of men to organize or the right to strike when a principle is involved—is this: What justification can labor find for striking on a jurisdictional question, in a food industry, when you and I and most of the other people of the United States—and I refer especially to the people of the Middle West—are striving in every way to develop and produce food which not only will feed the people of the United States but will aid in preventing the starvation and devastation of Europe? What justification can a jurisdictional strike have in such a case as that mentioned in the letter I have just read, where no question of working conditions is involved, no question of pay is involved, no question of the economics is involved, but the matter involved is only a division or a discussion or a virtual battle in regard to jurisdiction? I shall be pleased to have the Senator's comments on that point.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am very happy to make a few comments for the benefit of the Senator from Iowa. In my remarks I have at no time undertaken to defend jurisdictional strikes. I am not familiar with what the present machinery is, if any, for handling such matters; but the jurisdictional strike is one form of strike to handle which I feel the Government should have compulsory arbitration machinery.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Government should have arbitrary power to

settle that kind of a strike, is not the principle just the same in regard to any kind of strike?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In other words, can the Senator from Idaho differentiate between different kinds of strikes?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; the principle is not the same. It is altogether different. I would see to it that we work to secure adequate machinery so as absolutely to prevent jurisdictional strikes. Surely, we can contrive democratic machinery for elections in such cases, and can see to it that they are honestly held. When they are, that should settle the matter; and there should be penalties, in my estimation, to prevent anyone from striking because a jurisdictional strike is settled in favor of one or the other party to the strike.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator to yield to permit me to make a very brief comment in regard to certain remarks made by my friend the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], as shown in yesterday's RECORD on page 5098, in the first column.

In fairness to the Senator from Minnesota, as well as in fairness to myself, I think that any basis for any misinterpretation of his remarks insofar as applying them to the junior Senator from Oregon should be cleared up. I say "misinterpretation" because although I am satisfied that the junior Senator from Minnesota was not in fact referring to the junior Senator from Oregon, nevertheless, newspapermen who have talked to me earlier today seem to be laboring under the impression that his remarks were intended to relate to me.

I now read from page 5098 of yesterday's RECORD. The junior Senator from Minnesota said, yesterday afternoon:

I think it has become perfectly clear that the group of Senators who are opposed to having the Senate vote on any kind of labor legislation which is opposed by the leaders, although not necessarily by the rank and file of organized labor, are determined to do their best to talk the pending legislation to death, in other words, to filibuster. I think it is rather significant that most of these Senators are the ones who have always protested most loudly when any other minority in the Senate attempted the same tactics.

I simply wish to say in regard to securing Senate action on the measure now pending before the Senate that the junior Senator from Oregon was one of the members of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor who took the position in the committee that the measure should be reported by the committee, either favorably or unfavorably, to the floor of the Senate, so that the Members of the Senate could at the earliest possible date vote on it. I announced that I would move to discharge the committee unless it reported the legislation to the Senate. I expressed the hope that it would report unfavorably on the Case bill, which it did.

I wish to say for the RECORD—I think I have made my position clear in the meetings of the Committee on Education and Labor—that I do not favor filibuster-

ing against any measure, be it one which I favor or one which I oppose. So far as I am concerned, the junior Senator from Minnesota will find me, in this debate, just as soon as I am satisfied that the debate on the merits of the pending measure has been completed, joining in an attempt to see to it that the discussion ends and that the Senate proceeds to vote.

In the past I have signed cloture petitions. I shall always be willing to sign a cloture petition whenever I become convinced that an attempt is being made on the floor of the Senate to filibuster the measure then pending, I care not whether I am for it or against it.

As I have said to the Members of the Senate earlier in the debate, it is true that I am thoroughly opposed to most of the amendments to the bill now pending before the Senate. Yet I try to be a realist in connection with these matters. I believe a great job has been done in this country in propagandizing and stirring up public hostility against labor, with the result that the American people are now clamoring for antilabor legislation. I believe that they will get it. I do not believe there is anything which will stop it. I believe the Senate is in a mood to pass some antilabor legislation which I think will prove to be in the best interest of neither labor nor industry, and, most important of all, it will prove not to be in the public interest. But I believe also that, under our democratic form of government, whenever the Representatives of the people, in the Congress assembled, are ready to pass such legislation, they should have the right to pass the kind of legislation which they may think the American people want them to pass. Hence, I shall do all that I can from this desk, as soon as I am satisfied that the debate is completed on the merits, to see to it that Members of the Senate have an opportunity to vote on the amendments. If I become convinced that a filibuster is taking place I shall never hesitate to sign a cloture petition for the purpose of bringing about an opportunity to vote.

Mr. President, I close my remarks with this comment: The people of the country who are clamoring for antilabor legislation are apparently going to have to learn at a costly expense to themselves that democracy cannot be maintained when at the same time they seek, as a substitute for the principles of voluntarism on the basis of which democracy rests, government compulsions over the economic and social life of this Nation. One of the characteristics of freemen is that once they come to understand that an injustice has been done them, once they realize that there have been transgressions upon their inalienable rights of freedom, they will rise up against the laws which infringe upon their freedom.

Mr. President, I know that it is not politic, I know that the statement which I am about to make will be subject to misunderstanding, and I know that there may be those who will say that I do not believe in government by law, but I point out to the Senate that we will lose government by law whenever in a democratic society we adopt legal measures which

put too great a strain upon democracy. We cannot have democracy and at the same time, by strait-jacket legislation, impose upon freemen restrictions which they believe to be unjust and in violation of their right to seek a better standard of living through the voluntary procedures of group economic action.

I venture the prediction that when the Senate completes its consideration of the pending measure, and passes the type of legislation which I believe it will pass in response to a momentary Nation-wide hostility to labor, it will have bought for the American people instance after instance of violence and instance after instance of law violation, because as the Government seeks to enforce that type of legislation we will find freemen resisting it, and instead of strengthening government by law it will greatly weaken it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his splendid remarks. I am honored to have an expression of his sentiments appear in the RECORD along with the remarks which I have been allowed to make.

Mr. President, in concluding my remarks I wish to read a paragraph or two from a book entitled "Cartels—Challenge to a Free World." The author of the book is Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General of the United States. I wish that through the medium of the RECORD, or in some other way, I could broadcast to the people of the United States the entire contents of the book and let them see clearly from what direction the real danger lies to our democracy and our free enterprise system. In this particular case the author of the book is talking about patents, and the abuse of patent rights. He says:

It is ironical but true that while a patent is supposed to give protection and encouragement to the inventor, possession of a patent today is little more than an invitation to predatory litigation. The threat of expensive and protracted patent litigation is perhaps the most effective means by which monopoly enforces its private rule on industry to eliminate competition.

The small businessman facing such obstacles has limited choices of action. He can sue the large group, or risk suit, but in either event will find himself involved in a costly, lengthy process. He generally emerges with a broken spirit and a petition in bankruptcy.

The files of the Department of Justice are crowded with complaints and pleadings of these little men. They have found these handicaps insuperable in their attempts to compete. In giving testimony before the Temporary National Economic Committee, one small manufacturer in the glass-container industry recited a tale which is frequently and tragically repeated throughout many branches of production. This particular witness, sued for infringement on nine or ten counts, stated:

"We naturally were finally forced to hire a patent attorney. We had to acquire the services of a Texas attorney, and I think there are some two or three patent attorneys in the State. They brought us into court in April of 1935, as I recall. Well, when I arrived in San Angelo and met them there in the hotel I can conservatively say there was a half train load of attorneys and equipment. There were motion-picture projectors and attorneys all over the place. I don't know anyone of the Hartford legal staff that was not there. They were prepared to give us a nice battle. Well, I had only one at-

torney and he was considerably lost in that crowd. I wish you might have seen his face that morning. So I promptly asked for a recess until the afternoon in order to see if we couldn't settle the case out of court."

As the witness testified at the time, the "settlement" was "a sort of slow death arrangement."

That is why I say, Mr. President, that I shall not vote to make it possible to drag labor unions and individual workers into the courts, because great monopolies have the power to keep them continually in the courts. No issue would be settled, because labor would not take it lying down, as many small businessmen have been forced to do. Friction between management and labor would be increased, and more strikes, rather than fewer strikes, would be caused.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate for its kind indulgence. I repeat that in the year and a half during which I have been a Member of the Senate, up until the talk which I am now completing, I addressed the Senate probably not longer, altogether, than an hour and a half. I therefore resent the implications made yesterday on the floor of the Senate that I was in any way indulging in a filibuster. I believe those implications were entirely out of order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hayden	Overton
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bankhead	Hill	Reed
Barkley	Hoey	Revercomb
Brewster	Huffman	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bushfield	Knowland	Smith
Butler	La Follette	Stanfill
Byrd	Langer	Stewart
Capehart	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McMahon	Tunnell
Eastland	Magnuson	Tydings
Ellender	Maybank	Wagner
Ferguson	Mead	Walsh
George	Millikin	Wheeler
Gerry	Moore	Wherry
Guffey	Morse	White
Gurney	Murdock	Wiley
Hart	Murray	Wilson
Hatch	O'Daniel	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator

from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WELLS] is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

AMERICAN FAILURE NOW WOULD BE TRAGEDY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise today out of a profound feeling that the United States and the world are facing one of the greatest crises of modern times. By what we do now, by our ability to meet the fundamental issues which are presented, and to rise above the irresponsibility and demoralization which are obvious on every hand, we shall determine, it seems to me, whether or not the world will profit by the American experiment in free government.

No greater tragedy could occur to mankind at this hour than the failure of the American people to compose the differences which are now tearing them apart and to devise a comprehensive policy under which all branches of our economy may cooperate to win industrial peace.

We cannot hope to win international peace while engaged in economic warfare at home.

The time has come for plain speech. Senators gather in committee rooms, they gather in the cloakrooms, they gather at luncheon and at dinner, and in their private conversations they all acknowledge that they never saw a time when conditions were more confused and uncertain, in Congress and in the country, than they are at this moment. Not in 160 years has there been such a situation as that in which we now find ourselves. I say 160 years advisedly, because I am thinking of the conditions which existed after the victory had been obtained by the colonists in the American Revolution.

After the Constitutional Convention had completed its labors, and it was known that an agreement had been reached upon a draft of a new Constitution, Benjamin Franklin, we are told, was leaving the Convention Hall in Philadelphia when he was approached by a woman who sought to inquire what the result had been. "What sort of a government do we have, Mr. Franklin?" she asked. He said, "A republic"; and then added, "if we can keep it."

Mr. President, I think those words of Franklin in 1787 are almost true now. We shall be blind to what is going on in

the world if we do not realize that the very foundations of free government are tottering and that men are turning backward toward central arbitrary power.

Because the people of America had been made free and, under the Constitution, were able to make their own living in their own way, develop the resources of the land, and work for progress, this country became the greatest Nation in the history of the world, the wealthiest industrial Nation, the most productive Nation. We were sheltered by a vast expanse of ocean from aggressor nations which might have desired to seize our resources. We were protected by nature itself, and we were free to develop. Oppressed peoples of all the world came to the United States, and here in freedom they worked out a new era of civilization for mankind. They raised the standard of living higher than it had ever been before anywhere. More of the people in the United States shared in the benefits of prosperity than ever shared in the good things of life on any continent or in any nation.

A FREE WORLD IS ENDANGERED

Now, however, Mr. President, because of the tremendous advance brought about by technological gains and inventive genius, all boundaries have been practically wiped away. The oceans mean nothing now. They are no longer a protection against aggressive warfare. They are not, Mr. President, a protection against the invasion of alien ideas. Everybody knows that the world is now facing the choice between free government and arbitrary government. There can be no doubt about it. We must make up our minds whether we want a free world or whether we are going to permit ourselves to drift into a controlled world. If the world is to be free, then it is to be free for all men, for all races and all classes of men. If it is to be a controlled world, it will be controlled by arbitrary power exercised by private groups, a situation which we describe as monopolistic imperialism, or it will be controlled by arbitrary government, which we describe as totalitarianism.

We are confronted with that choice, Mr. President. The world is confronted with it. Mankind now trembles upon the very brink of doom, and by what we do in the United States, by our ability to appraise the problems which confront us and our willingness in the democratic manner to reach a solution of them, will depend, in my judgment, whether or not the world will go forward under the principles of democratic freedom, or whether it will go backward to a long period of arbitrary control. How can we hesitate here to make the choice?

Mr. President, the time has come, it seems to me, to make an appeal to the conscience and the good sense of the American people. Perhaps I should not say it that way. Perhaps I should say first that the appeal should be made to the conscience and the good sense of Congress, because, Mr. President, irresponsibility has been exhibited in these halls. I do not charge Members of the House or Members of the Senate with any

conscious failure to meet the tragic issue of our time, for I know that there has been such a concentration of difficult and confusing problems that it is impossible to give to each problem the time it deserves. Senators know it is almost impossible to obtain a quorum in any committee of the Senate or the House, but we act as though things were normal and somehow will work themselves out.

Senators talk about streamlining Congress, as though that would clear the air; as though by making fewer committees we would make it more possible for Congress to function. That is not the problem. It is not the committee organization of the Senate or the House that causes the near break-down of legislative government. It is the concentration here in Washington of all the problems of all the people and of all the areas of the United States.

We are beset by problems of debt and taxes. We are beset by problems of wages and prices and profits. We are beset by problems of housing and food and clothing. We are beset by problems of military power—the draft, the merger of the Army and the Navy, the atomic bomb. We are beset by problems of peace. They all crowd in upon the Executive and upon the legislative in such a manner that it is impossible for us to meet our responsibilities.

My heart goes out, Mr. President, to the man in the White House for the burdens that are being carried by him. The same pressures that are exerted upon us are exerted upon him, but a hundred-fold greater. It is our duty to frame the laws, but do we not know, Mr. President, that for the past 13 years we have been adopting temporary measures to meet emergency conditions? Law after law is proposed merely to meet a situation as it exists at the moment. Temporary solutions rather than permanent have been the order of the decade.

We talk of free enterprise, and we adopt control measures. We declaim against Federal interference in local affairs, and we pass bills that deliver local areas into the hands of the Federal power. We say that the Government should not spend, but when the crisis comes, even those of us who have said that clamor for the appropriations because they meet the particular exigency which seems in our State or in our district to be the one most necessary to be met.

OUR WHOLE ECONOMY THREATENED

And here we are, after having demonstrated by what was done during this war that the United States has the genius and the capacity to produce beyond that possessed by any other people or nation in history, and knowing this, we are drifting into a state of chaos.

Every little segment of the economy is clamoring to protect its own small interest, and the whole economy is threatened with destruction. This group or that group asks for special legislation to give it a particular advantage. Because we are dominated by fear, it seems that we do not have the courage or the conscience to trust ourselves or our American system.

THE ERA AFTER THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

I have stated that the condition in which we find ourselves is very much like that which existed after the American Revolution. Last Sunday night I took down Woodrow Wilson's *History of the American People*. I wish to read a paragraph from page 28 of volume 3. He was describing the situation which existed among the 13 sovereign independent States after they had won their freedom.

There was everywhere a sort of moral exhaustion, a relaxation of the very principles of just and temperate government which the war had been fought to vindicate; a loss of tone, an excess of perilous agitation.

The words apply at this hour. The time has come for men of tolerance and moderation to look at facts as they exist. We are being belabored by extremists upon both sides, who because they fear the loss of what they have and seek to protect it for themselves, are undermining the whole structure of prosperity and harmony and progress among all of the people of the United States.

O Mr. President, if the United States and the people of the United States who produced in such tremendous quantities to win the war cease now to produce to win the peace because of fancied advantage that this group or that group thinks it may obtain, then we perish and the world perishes with us. Millions of people are starving in Europe and Asia, needing the food which we can produce. We suffered more than one million casualties in this war, a war which was fought, like the American Revolution, to vindicate the great principle of the right of the people to govern themselves. When we look abroad we see that although statism in one form was defeated in Germany and Italy, statism itself still exists; and wherever statism exists, wherever totalitarian power exists, the people are compelled to bow the knee to arbitrary authority.

Woodrow Wilson said that the people of the Thirteen Original States had experienced a moral exhaustion. What about us? What about the demobilization of our military forces before the peace has been wrought and before the principles for which this Nation stands have been made secure? We proved them in war, but we must prove them in peace, and if we delay, they may easily be swept away.

It was just 160 years ago, Mr. President, when Captain Shay, a veteran of Bunker Hill, a veteran of Washington's patriotic Continental Army, led a rebellion in Massachusetts. He and his followers had come to entertain the feeling that because Federal authority was lacking, because there was no stability, because there were injustices, the time had come for insurrection. His movement was typical of the ferment and turmoil visible everywhere through the new country.

Wilson's testimony is not the only testimony we have. I recommend to Members of Congress the reading of Madison's preface to his notes on the Constitutional Convention. He, too, described

the situation that existed among the people of the Original States. He said:

The principal difficulties which embarrassed the progress, and retarded the completion, of the plan of Confederation may be traced to:

First, the natural repugnance of the parties to a relinquishment of power.

Is not that a condition which we see on every hand today—the natural reluctance of the parties to a relinquishment of power?

Secondly, a natural jealousy of its abuse in other hands than their own.

A natural jealousy! We see it everywhere displayed, because fear stalks the land—fear that we may lose what we have, and that by some small and narrow and selfish action we may protect ourselves though the rest of the Nation suffers. It is a pitiful delusion, Mr. President.

Thirdly, the rule of suffrage among parties whose inequality in size did not correspond with that of their wealth or of their military or free populations.

Fourthly, the selection and definition of the powers, at once necessary to the Federal head, and safe to the several members.

Are we not now suffering because of this precise condition with respect to the selection and definition of power? Though it does not affect the basic charter of our national being, it does deal with the whole economic order.

But that is not all, Mr. President. On page 120 of volume 5 of Elliott's Debates I find this most significant paragraph from the pen of James Madison, descriptive of the situation which existed before the Constitutional Convention was called:

As a natural consequence of this distracted and disheartening condition of the Union—

Having described it in more detail than I have read—

the Federal authority had ceased to be respected abroad, and dispositions were shown there, particularly in Great Britain, to take advantage of its imbecility, and to speculate on its approaching downfall.

Mr. President, do we not read in the dispatches which come to us from Paris that at this very hour our allies in winning the war are speculating upon our unwillingness to hold to the line which we adopted in defense of human liberty when we entered the war? Do we not know that, instead of a world negotiation for a world at peace, the Allies have fallen into disunity; power politics has raised its head; and eminent writers of every shade of opinion go so far as to say that Great Britain and Russia are at this hour shaping their policies in the conviction that the United States is weakening and as if there were going to be a third war.

At home—

Says Madison, in writing of the Thirteen Original Colonies—

Meaning the Government—

had lost all confidence and credit; the unstable and unjust career of the States had also forfeited the respect and confidence essential to order and good government, involving a general decay of confidence and credit between man and man.

Mr. President, we are on the very brink of that same disorder now. People are fearful of what will happen next, because we have been dealing, not with the fundamentals of reorganization and reconversion, but only with little segments of it, here and there. We have been drifting along, taking only stopgap measures, hoping that something finally will emerge which will settle our difficulties and restore a feeling of confidence and peace and prosperity among the people.

Mr. President, I have a profound faith and confidence in the people of America. I always have had, and it has always been justified. I think all through the history of this Government, demonstration after demonstration has proved that confidence to be well-founded. The people of the United States will respond to what is fair and just if we who occupy positions of public responsibility will confront the facts as they are. What we need to do is to issue the call to the people of America that this is the hour for all of them to stand together to maintain the very basis of free government and a free economy.

THERE IS PLENTY FOR ALL

There can be no doubt, Mr. President, that if complete cooperation were secured, there would be plenty for all. There would be fair profits; there would be reasonable prices; there would be adequate wages. If, instead of trying to cut this pie before it is baked, we call upon the people of America to bake the pie first, then I say to you, Mr. President, there will be pieces aplenty for all who wish to share. Labor will not suffer, management will not suffer, the farmers will not suffer, no branch of our economy will suffer, provided only we give to the common sense of America an opportunity to express itself, and turn aside from the activity of those who stand upon the extremes.

Mr. President, listen again to Madison as he continues to describe the conditions which existed 160 years ago:

It was found, moreover, that those least partial to popular government—

I ask Senators to heed these words of James Madison—

It was found, moreover, that those least partial to popular government, or most distrustful of its efficacy, were yielding to anticipations, that, from an increase of the confusion, a government might result more congenial with their taste or their opinions.

THE PRODUCT OF CONFUSION

Mr. President, do we not know that those who preach the ideology of the communistic state depend upon confusion to produce it? Wherever totalitarianism has appeared, it has come into existence because the people permitted confusion to blind their eyes and close their minds to the essential needs of freedom. We know that the totalitarian believes that a small group can seize power, if only there is confusion enough. That is the way dictatorship arises.

In the days following the Revolution, when the condition which I am describing in the words of Madison existed, the Army offered George Washington arbitrary power. They said, "Give us the word and we will make you king." It is

one of the shining facets of his character that he was able to resist that plea to power. He put the temptation aside, and in due course he presided over the Constitutional Convention, and became the first President of a free Republic, the authority of which flows, in all matters, economic and political, from the people themselves. That is our ideal, Mr. President.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield a moment to me? I wish to emphasize a point, if I may.

Let me say that I think the Senator is making a very wonderful speech. I think he is delivering a message to the Senate and to the people of the United States that should be carefully thought over and carefully diagnosed, analyzed, and digested. I wish to emphasize the point the Senator has made about confusion.

The very condition he has described is exactly what I find, not only in the Senate, but throughout the entire United States. I have been talking to people everywhere in our country. Confusion is leading to bewilderment, and the people are distressed and annoyed. Confusion, continued, leads to lack of cooperation, and lack of cooperation, continued, leads to nonproduction of the things the people need, the very necessities of life. And that situation leads to distress and misery, and distress and misery among the people make fertile soil for the planting of false ideologies and false isms.

That is all I wish to say at this point in the Senator's wonderful speech.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. I think his remarks are altogether appropriate and consistent with what I have been trying to say.

Mr. President, I interrupted the reading of Madison's description only to make a comment upon the existence of confusion which characterized the period between the victory at Yorktown and the Constitutional Convention. Allow me to read again:

It was found, moreover, that those least partial to popular government, or most distrustful of its efficacy, were yielding to anticipations, that, from an increase of the confusion, a government might result more congenial with their taste or their opinions; whilst those most devoted to the principles and forms of republics were alarmed for the cause of liberty itself, at stake in the American experiment, and anxious for a system that would avoid the inefficiency of a mere confederacy, without passing into the opposite extreme of a consolidated government.

Mr. President, could words more accurately describe the situation as it exists today? The fundamental difficulty existing among us now is the fear of a great segment of the people that there are loose in the Nation those who would take advantage of confusion in order to establish their own type of arbitrary control. On the other hand, there are those who push away every suggestion of constructive reform, because of the fear that it may destroy the very basis of liberty.

AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE PEOPLE

That was the situation which existed from 1783 to 1787. Mr. President, if Senators will read the accounts of the

debates held in the Continental Congress of that time, they will see precisely the same conditions as those under which we now labor. The Members of the Continental Congress were spending their time in trying to patch here and patch there, to do this and to do that, to collect a few taxes so as to pay the national expenses, or to pay the veterans, or to take some action to promote trade and commerce. Because there was great pressure of all kinds of conflicting ideas, and because there was violent controversy, the Members of the Continental Congress were unable to undertake constructive action. So finally the initiative was taken by one of the States to call a national conference, to which all the States would send commissioners to consider all factors of the problem, and make a suggestion for a remedy that would have the support of all. It was an appeal to the good sense and the conscience of the people. The Constitutional Convention was a great triumph of the American spirit of freedom. First of all, the Continental Congress reposed its trust and confidence in those men and in their ability and patriotic devotion to the common good, in their willingness to set aside selfish advantages, in their willingness to balance the interests of the States and preserve the national interest, in their willingness to sacrifice power for local, selfish ends, in order that the power of all might be made secure. That was the Constitutional Convention. It appealed to the patriotic instincts of all the people, and it turned aside from the sniping, from the sabotage, and from the irresponsibility that marked that era. It afforded an opportunity for the people of America to express their willingness—nay, their will—to have a government which would preserve the rights of all.

Such, Mr. President, is the situation which confronts us now. That is why, when bills come upon this floor dealing with the controversial issues which are tearing us apart, we divide into contrary camps and debate about details when we ought to be giving our time and attention to the fundamental which is involved. That fundamental is, Mr. President, the development of an economic rule of order that will release the tremendous capacity of America to produce, and by producing teach the totalitarians and the monopolists that there is enough to go around in a really free economy.

O Mr. President, we stand at the very entrance of the land of promise. We need only the courage to enter it. If we do not enter it we will wander in the desert for generations. We know what we have been able to do. It is absurd to contend that the Nation which produced the armament that crushed the Axis—Germany, Italy, and Japan—cannot repeat the performance in a campaign for prosperity and peace.

We will not be able to solve the question now confronting us by a resort to force. If any substantial group of the people of America believe that force is being exercised against them, regardless of whether in fact it is being exercised or not, the result will be the same. I know that whether Americans reside on the farm or on the ranch, whether they

are employed in the shop or in the professional office, whether they are in the ranks of management or in the ranks of labor, their hearts are all essentially sound, and they believe in America. I know that they believe in freedom and justice for all. They do not want to have anyone receive an advantage over another. They would welcome an opportunity to find a solution which would do justice to all. It is for us to give it to them. I believe that we can do so, Mr. President.

What America needs at this moment is an economic constitution just as, 160 years ago, it needed a political Constitution. The present situation has come about through perfectly natural forces which could not be resisted. Because of the progress which has been made by science and invention, our economy has ceased to be an individual structure and has become a structure of great organizations. Persons talk about the expansion of the power of the Federal Government, but it has been taking place for more than 50 years under all sorts of administrations, both conservative and progressive.

The Federal power has increased because conditions made it necessary that it should increase. When the railroads spread across the continent, and were no longer capable of being regulated in the public interest by the States, Congress by law created the Interstate Commerce Commission. Democrats and Republicans alike participated in enacting that law, and from that day down to this, when problems which were no longer capable of being solved locally have arisen, then national solutions were provided. So, a short time ago Congress passed the airport bill. There was no great division over that. It was passed by the Senate and House without any extended debate or division as to its essential provisions, because it was recognized that the Federal Government had to act to preserve the public interest, even though it takes the National Government into thousands of local communities.

We passed a housing bill a few days ago because we needed emergency housing, and though many of us object to Federal spending, though we object to subsidies, we disregarded our feelings and subsidies were written into the law because it happened to be necessary because the Federal Government had to act; and if it had not acted, there would have been chaos.

I could relate the history of the expansion of trade and commerce, and cite instance after instance, in Democratic administration and in Republican administration, when the Federal power to regulate was expanded. Mr. President, I very well remember, for example, the time when President Harding signed the Packers and Stockyards Act and gave the Secretary of Agriculture the power to provide regulations to govern packing houses and stockyards. So it is we are driven by hard facts to an expanded Federal Government, but we have done nothing to preserve local and individual authority. We have not developed the rule of order our organized economy demands.

We talk about government of men and government of law. Emergency after emergency has arisen in this country, and the President, during such emergencies, disregarding Congress, has called individuals together to try to suggest some remedy. When the depression struck during the administration of President Hoover, he called the businessmen to the White House to work out a remedy by personal action. He had to step outside the customary machinery of government. All through the Roosevelt administration the same thing happened, and it is happening now. President Truman called a labor and management conference in the hope that somehow or other it might, by personal action provide a remedy.

THE PUBLIC INTEREST COMES FIRST

Mr. President, I venture to say that no rule of order can be provided in any partial conference, and by that I mean any conference which represents only a part of the people. It is the public interest which must be safeguarded in the present crisis and we must find a way to protect it; we must find a way to appeal to the conscience of the people of America.

THE ECONOMIC COUNCIL AVAILABLE

I think it can be done, Mr. President; I think the means are at hand. On February 20, 1946, the President gave his approval to an act to declare a national policy on employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes. Congress saw the necessity for action, and it created the machinery by which action could be obtained. There was a great debate about that measure. It was called the full employment bill. It is now called the maximum employment law.

There was a perfect example of how the fear, of which I have spoken, confuses issues. Many who criticized the bill were fearful that it meant a move to the left, to open the door to communism. Many who were for the bill felt that those who were resisting it were resisting it because they did not want to see full employment brought about.

Neither of those suspicions was correct. The Congress and the people of the United States wanted only to provide an opportunity for reconversion which would make it possible for us to do in peace what we had demonstrated we could do in war. The bill was finally enacted. It has given us the machinery we need, but we are not taking advantage of it.

Let me deal first with the laxity of Congress, because unless we expose our own failure, we cannot venture to point a finger at the failure of anybody else. Section 5 provides:

There is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Economic Report, to be composed of seven Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall, as nearly as may be feasible, reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

Then in the next paragraph of this section, describing the function of the joint committee, I find this:

It shall be the function of the joint committee . . . from time to time to make such . . . reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

Mr. President, that is the committee which should be appointed and put to work. The Joint Committee on the Economic State of the Nation should be appointed, and should be appointed without delay to tackle the problems which are arousing both fear and anger. Charged with a grave national duty I am certain it could inspire confidence.

But equally important, Mr. President, indeed more important, is section 4 which creates the Council of Economic Advisers. I read section 4 (a):

There is hereby created in the Executive Office of the President a Council of Economic Advisers (hereinafter called the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret economic developments, to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2, and to formulate and recommend national economic policy to promote employment, production, and purchasing power under free competitive enterprise.

There is the mandate, Mr. President. There is the instrumentality by which we can get to the fundamentals of the issues which are tearing us apart and rendering impossible the production which alone will save us.

What were the purposes declared in section 2? I read that section:

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

Does anyone doubt, Mr. President, that if the policy of that act were carried out our troubles would begin to fade? All that is needful, as I said at the beginning, to make an appeal to the conscience of the people of America now to go to work while the agency created by the Congress also goes to work to prepare recommendations to provide employment, to increase production, to raise purchasing power. Is not that the objective of us all? Is not that the objective of labor? Is it not the objective of management? Have we faith in ourselves? Have we faith in our own Government? Have we faith in our own instruments, our own system? If we do, then certainly we believe that we ought to give that system a chance to work.

Let the council be appointed, Mr. President. Let the joint committee be appointed. And while they are at work, just as when the members of the Constitutional Convention were at work, let the rest of the economy go to work also. Let us put aside our fears and resort to constructive cooperation. Let us concentrate upon production. And if we do that, trusting to this organization, authorized to be set up by Congress, to work out a rule of order for the distribution of the fruits of production, we shall have prosperity, we shall have good wages, we shall have good working conditions, we shall be able to build anew.

If we do not do that, Mr. President, if we now surrender to our fears, we risk the loss of all the fruits of our victory in this war; we risk the loss of the objectives for which 300,000 Americans laid down their lives, and for which a million others will bear to their graves the wounds of conflict. Nay, more, Mr. President, we shall lose not only the fruits of this victory, but we shall lose the fruits of the victory of the American Revolution, because free government is at stake. We know perfectly well that among the people of the world only the United States and the people of the United States seem to remain firm in their belief in a free government and a free economy. The task is for us to follow the example of the great men who created the Constitutional Convention and made possible the drafting of that charter of free government. If we only have faith in our system and in ourselves we can achieve prosperity for all, and we can set an example to the world demonstrating that freedom is the better policy.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

MEDIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4908) to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in speaking upon the subject matter of the pending bill I wish to address myself first to the amendment proposed by the honorable Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Permit me to say at the outset that it is incomprehensible to me that this amendment should have received the very vigorous and vociferous opposition it has met upon the floor of the Senate. There is nothing within the amendment, when properly analyzed, that can be criticized as being harmful either to management or to organized labor or to labor generally. It is an amendment which, in my opinion, meets not only an existing emergency and an existing crisis, but it is an amendment which ought to be embodied permanently in any law dealing with labor problems.

On page 2, line 12, of the amendment, there is contained a provision which I shall read:

(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable with respect to . . . any money or other thing of value paid to an organization or fund for furnishing health, welfare, or other benefits to employees and their families and dependents, if both employees and employers are represented in the administration of such organization or fund, with employees having the majority representation if they contribute more than half to the support of such organization or fund and with employers having the majority representation if they contribute more than half to the support of such organization or fund.

There is nothing, therefore, in the amendment that inhibits the establishment of health and hygienic programs, welfare programs, recreational programs, or other programs beneficial to labor. Organized labor can at any time, insofar as this amendment is concerned, adopt such a program, financing it themselves without let or hindrance by the employer or by the Federal Government. The only restriction, the only limitation placed upon such a program is that when a donor makes a contribution to the program the donor shall have a voice in the administration of the program. Is that unjust? Is that unreasonable? Is not that in line with common practice in respect to most charitable donations and bequests? Wherever a donor, a contributor, has an interest in the program, as the operators of mines and the operators of industry and the management of business generally would have, why should he not be given by legislative act a right of representation in the development of that program? It cannot be said that the management, after making the donation, would undertake to abuse such power as the amendment would provide for, because the management has as much interest as labor itself in the health and the happiness, in the pleasure and the recreation of its employees, and in a wise and practical administration of the investment. Management and employees are engaged in a common venture, and what helps labor in the performance of its duty toward production is beneficial to management. What reason would there be for the employer to undertake to run roughshod over any beneficial plan which labor itself might suggest in the development of such a program when it itself is contributing the funds for the financing of it?

Mr. President, to my mind the Byrd amendment, considered in its entirety, finds support on a bigger and broader basis than the one to which I have referred. We are dealing here in the main with collective bargaining. Collective bargaining is certainly not objectionable to the large majority of Members of the Senate. Collective bargaining is not objectionable to the majority of the Congress or the majority of the American people. Collective bargaining is considered by labor as one of the greatest rights vouchsafed to it by the Congress of the United States. We are dealing here with the representatives of organized labor, mainly in connection with collective bargaining. The representatives of organized labor occupy such a

fiduciary relation that they should be above any temptation. It is conceivable that management, desiring to obtain an undue advantage over organized labor, might use a contribution to the representative of organized labor for the purpose of corruption, for the purpose of having the representatives of organized labor ignore the best program for labor and subscribe to what management itself dictates.

The representatives of organized labor should be, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion. When I make that statement I am not making any criticism of John L. Lewis in his effort at collective bargaining at the present time, and in his demand that before the compensation of labor, the housing facilities offered labor, or any increase in safety appliances for the benefit of labor should be considered, at the very outset there should be a contribution, amounting to millions of dollars, to be paid to John L. Lewis himself.

I cannot for the moment say, because I have no proof of it, that Mr. Lewis is being actuated by any ulterior motive or by any hope of personal aggrandizement; but I can say that he is not placed above suspicion, because a number of letters which have come to my office indicate in the minds of some a belief that it is Mr. Lewis' purpose to use this fund not entirely for the benefit of the employees he represents, for their welfare, their recreation, their hospitalization, or their general care, but to use it for his own aggrandizement. Some believe that his motive is pecuniary; others think it is political.

Of course we know, Mr. President, of the huge fund which has been raised by the PAC and the CIO, a fund which is used, and will probably continue to be used, for political purposes. We know that the CIO has gone so far as to undertake to declare that it is its purpose to unseat certain Senators and certain Representatives; and, either openly or by implication, they propose to devote huge sums of money in order to achieve that purpose.

I should like to see a representative of organized labor in collective bargaining freed from such an imputation. It may be that John L. Lewis will use every dollar he can extort from the management of the mines exclusively for the benefit of labor. It may be that he will not use any of it for political purposes; and I am willing to hazard the guess that he will not, in any event, use it for his personal aggrandizement. But John L. Lewis is only one of hundreds of representatives of organized labor engaged in collective bargaining to arrive at agreements between labor and management in the operations of business and industry. While Mr. Lewis may, in the strength of his character and in the sternness of his purpose, hold himself free from temptation if such an opportunity should present itself, I seriously doubt that all representatives of organized labor would be quite that loyal to those whom they represent.

There is no necessity on my part—because the facts are too well known—to call attention to the existence of racketeers in the ranks of organized labor.

There are men who have taken advantage of the positions which they occupy in relation to labor to fill their own pockets. What objection, then, can there be to the Congress of the United States, which has granted to organized labor the right of collective bargaining, saying, "We propose to safeguard that right against its abuse by the representatives of labor"? Is there anything unduly restrictive about this amendment? Is it unjust to say that he who makes the contribution shall have a voice in the exercise of a benefit which exists by reason of that contribution?

Mr. President, I cannot see why there is any objection to this particular amendment. While we may have to move with due conservatism and foresight, careful deliberation and consideration of the great issue underlying management-labor legislation, yet I think it is time for the Congress of the United States to act. I believe in organized labor. I believe in the right of labor to organize, and I believe in its right collectively to bargain. But I do not believe in dictators of labor over either management or other industries, or over the American people.

It is not necessary for me to undertake to show the great damage which has already been done by reason of the dictatorship of one man over the labor of one industry in this country. This example may be multiplied by scores yet to come, until in truth and in fact there may be a paralysis of all industry in this country.

Mr. President, as I have said, I am not opposed to organized labor in its exercise of certain legitimate rights. But insofar as labor is concerned, I do not stand here to advocate solely the rights of organized labor. I believe in protecting, insofar as we can legislatively do so, the rights of all labor, whether organized or not organized. While I believe in organized labor, there are practices of organized labor to which I cannot subscribe. Far more transcendental, far more important than the rights of organized labor, is the right of the American citizen who is able and willing to work to have an opportunity to work, and not be denied that opportunity by his fellow laborers because they are organized and he is not organized, or because they pay tribute to a union—pay initiation fees and dues—and he is unwilling to buy his right to work for his bread and his meat in this, the greatest Republic in the history of the world.

When we come to think about it, the most fundamental right which we ought to be able to protect is the right of any American citizen—I care not whether he belongs to a union or does not belong to a union, whether he belongs to this church or does not belong to that church, whether he belongs to this fraternal organization or does not belong to that fraternal organization, whether he belongs to this political party or belongs to some other political party—to have the right, when an employer wants to employ him, to take that employment without having to purchase the right to work from any private organization or from any public organization or from any source whatever. When we depart from that right, I think we are getting into

trouble, and I think the history of the last few months shows it and the history of the last few years shows it.

A strike could be broken up, in many instances, if those who were willing to work in place of those who were unwilling to work, could be offered and could accept employment. Why should they not, and why is it not in the interest of the Government to enable them to do it, and why is it not in the interest of the great consuming public of the United States that productive labor should go on?

We started on this reconstruction period, this reconversion period, full of high hopes and full of glamor. The troops had come back, after winning the hardest-fought war and the greatest war in all the history of the world. We expected to go ahead and win the peace. We expected to produce and produce, until production, which enforced idleness had greatly lessened by reason of the demands of war, with a resultant increase in consumer demand, had reached its prewar extent. But we had not advanced far, we had hardly taken a step beyond the threshold of war, when we were met with hostility at home. Here is a Nation hungering for more food. Here is a Nation wanting more clothes. Here are people wanting hundreds of household things for their homes. Across the seas, people are starving for lack of food and are dying of chill for want of raiment; and production is halted in a land where there are hundreds and thousands and millions of able-bodied men who are willing and able to take the places of those who do not want to work and who are unwilling to work. But they cannot do so. They cannot do so, under and by virtue of the protection which the bounty of the United States Government has thrown around those who wish to stand in the picket line and say, "Don't cross it. If you dare cross it, if you dare cross it to engage in production for the people of America and to help the starving people of the world, we propose to manhandle you and keep you out."

Mr. President, is that Americanism? It is true Americanism? It is not the Americanism for which I shall stand. It is a wonder to me and it is a wonder to millions of the American people that the Congress of the United States has permitted this thing to go on, without taking prompt action. It has been said by many—and every Senator within the sound of my voice knows that it has been said—that Congress, if left alone with its own conception of what is right and proper, would not hesitate to enact legislation which would cure the evils under which we are now suffering. But it is said—not merely by letters, but publicly said, said over the radio and in editorials and in magazine articles—that there are a large number of Members of the House of Representatives and a large number of Senators—enough, at least, to have the balance of power—who stand in the way of such legislation because they stand in fear of the retribution and the vengeance which would be visited upon them by organized labor. I am passing no judgment on that situation, Mr. President. For the moment I am not undertaking to criticize Congress, either as a body, or

any Member of it individually. I merely am pointing out that which we all know. The criticism is there.

It is true, Mr. President, that organized labor is a potent force politically in this country. It is a potent force because it is organized and for the most part it votes as a unit. For the most part its members march to the music and follow the flag of the union and go to the ballot box and cast their ballots, as a rule, as the dictators of the organization prescribe that they shall. It is true that in many a congressional district and in many a State the votes of organized labor hold the balance of power. What happens? Oh, the public may be wrong and the public may be right; I am not here to pass judgment upon that. But they say that their representatives in the House of Representatives and their representatives in the Senate dare not align themselves against the wishes—yea, against the dictates—of organized labor, for fear that they will lose their offices at the next election.

There are those who write and tell me that there are Senators and Representatives who have said: "I do not propose to commit political suicide. I can go along with labor 99 times out of 100, but if I do not go along with labor the one-hundredth time it will wreak its vengeance upon me, and my political career will come to an untimely end."

Mr. President, I think that is probably true. I believe that a Senator or a Representative can go along with organized labor day after day, week after week, and year after year, and then, if he dares to stand up once and vote his convictions contrary to the demands of organized labor, and thereby incurs its wrath, he will be blacklisted as a future candidate for election to the United States Congress.

So, Mr. President, it is true that organized labor exercises an unduly potent influence in our legislative councils. I am sure that those of us who have served for years in the Senate recall that when we first came here, we received courteous letters from the representatives of unions, requesting that we earnestly consider such and such a measure, either with the view of opposing it or with the view of supporting it, and stating further that they would very much appreciate our compliance with their suggestions. But today we receive telegrams demanding that we fight for such and such a bill, and demanding that we support it. Those demands are frequently accompanied by the threat, in effect, "If you do not do this we shall defeat you at the polls."

Mr. President, I am not throwing any bouquets at myself for my method of handling such demands. I have received many of them. As a rule, I throw them into the wastebasket. I have been told that if I did not fight such and such a measure, organized labor would fight me. Nevertheless, I fought for the measure. I have also received messages to the effect that if I did not fight for such and such a bill I would be fought by organized labor. I fought against the bill.

I do not think it makes very much difference when we once get the issue

clearly before the people. I believe that the majority of the people of this country are patriotic. I believe they are willing to support conscientious representatives of the people who undertake to do their duty as God gives them the light and wisdom to see that duty.

Mr. President, I recall that several years ago I let a contract for the construction of a business building. The contractor was a nonunion contractor, and he employed nonunion labor. My building was picketed by organized labor. They marched up and down, up and down. I paid no attention to them. The work progressed. However, some of my friends put out counter pickets, and they had a number of persons marching up and down. The pickets of organized labor carried banners stating "The Senator is unfair to organized labor." The counter pickets carried banners reading "The Senator is fair to all labor." Of course, I had tried to be fair to all labor. I believe that unorganized labor is receiving a rather poor and shabby deal.

Mr. President, if I may be pardoned for making another personal reference I should like to say that only the other day I wanted to have another building painted. I personally and deliberately employed a nonunion contractor, who in turn employed nonunion labor, to do the work. I did so because those men were nonunion members and could not obtain employment. However, they were American citizens and were friends of mine. Perhaps more of them voted for me than did those who belonged to unions. But whether they did or did not made no difference to me. They were American citizens who were entitled to recognition, as such, and were entitled to an opportunity to work. I felt no hesitancy in giving them that opportunity.

Mr. President, we are going rapidly from bad to worse. We talk about fighting dictatorship, but we now have a dictatorship over the economic growth and development of our country, exercised through the heads of great institutions of organized labor. Today the miners—how many are there?

Mr. BARKLEY. There are approximately 500,000 bituminous-coal miners.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well. Approximately 500,000 American citizens are at the beck and call of one man. Today they drop their picks and shovels at his beck and call, and pick them up at his beck and call. Tomorrow they will do the same. The coal-mining industry is standing paralyzed, and countless other industries are being subjected to the virus of a creeping paralysis. Dictatorship is on the march, and we stand here doing nothing. I am no prophet, but I make the prediction that, as much as I regret it, if this Congress adjourns by the middle of July, no legislation worth while will have been enacted to prevent a continuance of the present strangulation of American industry and American business at a time when we are trying to reconvert a great people, a great republic, a great commonwealth, to a new life, new aspirations, and new hopes.

Mr. President, I wish to speak plainly. I am sick and tired of this situation. I

should like to see the leadership of the Senate and the leadership of the other House take a forward and progressive stand in this matter. I know that my feeble voice will reach scarcely anywhere, but there is one vote, namely, my own, which will be cast to eradicate any malpractices on the part of organized labor.

Mr. President, behold organized labor publicly and brazenly declaring that it will purge the House of Representatives and the Senate of Members obnoxious to them and will substitute them with men who will do their abject bidding and be their abject slaves in the halls of the greatest legislative body in the world and in all human history.

There is one answer, and only one answer, and I hope it will be a practical one. The great majority of the people are interested on the other side. The great majority of the American people are the consuming public. It is the consuming public who are the greatest sufferers. The losses they suffer are not compensated for. Labor may be compensated by higher wages, and by this and by that, management by higher prices, but what the consuming public loses is gone forever; and they are in the overwhelming majority. Why, then, do they submit? They have the answer in their own hands.

I had the pleasure only day before yesterday to write to a prominent citizen of Louisiana who was severely criticizing Congress, including me, for our inaction in this great crisis. I said to him, in effect, "The fault lies not so much with us as with you, my dear sir and friend; with you and the countless other millions of American citizens. You have the remedy. Why do not you and other prominent citizens get together and organize a consumers' union, a consumers' league, a consumers' organization? You suffer at the hands of organized labor, because organized labor votes, and you often do not. Organized labor votes as a unit, and you do not. Organized labor holds the balance of power in many a congressional district, and in many a State, and sends its own Representatives to the Halls of Congress; you do not. The way to fight organized labor is to employ against it the very tactics organized labor uses, that is, to organize and to organize politically."

If that were done and such a program were carried out in a Nation-wide movement, it would gather momentum, and not only would the complexion of the present Congress be changed to advantage, but the very hue and color of the views of some of the present Members would undergo a change. I am quite sure, because, after all, votes are influential, votes are controlling, votes are dominating, and we have to pay heed to the sources from which the votes come.

I do hope, Mr. President, that somewhere in this broad land there will be someone of sufficient know-how, of sufficient courage, of sufficient ability, of sufficient dynamic force, to start a movement which will organize the consumers of this great country into a union in order that they may stand up for consumers' rights in this Nation. Let labor have its just rights, let organized labor have

its just rights, and let the consumers have theirs.

Mr. President, I go now to another theme, which I have already touched on before in the Senate. It would be my own solution for the present debacle in which we are. It was spoken of here this morning, or yesterday, by some speaker.

I suggested months ago on the floor of the Senate that in all major disputes between management and labor the disputes should be carried ultimately before a tribunal whose decision would be final and binding. If two American citizens have an unsettled dispute, they go into court, and the decisions of the courts are binding. They are enforced under the law of our land. As a nation we are submitting our international controversies before an international tribunal. Are organized labor and management so damnably powerful in this country that they rise superior to all the American people, superior to the Nation itself? It would seem so. I think it was the American Bar Association which a few days ago went on record, at least one of its great speakers did, advocating that the tribunal to settle these disputes be our constituted courts of justice. There is no objection to that. Let these controversies be settled in a lawful and in an orderly way, not by ruthless violence, not by political domination or attempted political domination of the Congress of the United States.

If we would pass an act making provision for that, placing the ultimate decision of these controversies in some great tribunal which would have the confidence of the American people, we would not only have gone a long way, but I think we would have succeeded in solving the problem now facing us.

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES FOR VETERANS

Mr. MEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall take only about 10 minutes, in placing some excerpts in the RECORD, if it will not discommode my colleague from West Virginia to wait. I shall be glad to yield to him at any time if he sees the hour is drawing near for his departmental appointment.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, yesterday before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor a hearing was held on two bills which I introduced some time ago. They were Senate bill 2085 and Senate bill 1770, and amendments to S. 1770, having as their objective providing our colleges and universities with educational facilities to carry out the GI educational program.

At the hearing yesterday representatives of American colleges and universities appeared and made some very effective and far-reaching statements, some of which I believe are worthy of insertion in the RECORD, for I am sure they will be of great benefit to my colleagues.

I have here a statement of Mr. Ralph McDonald, Executive Secretary, Department of Higher Education, the National Education Association of the United States. Mr. McDonald said:

On behalf of the organized educators of

America I want to give the strongest possible endorsement to the bills now under consideration by your committee, S. 1770 and S. 2085. We sincerely hope that these measures, with minor amendments, may be passed by Congress before the summer recess.

A very interesting statement was also made by Mr. McDonald when he said:

In order to present the picture of the need as precisely and as clearly as possible I desire to lay before your committee a factual summary of the urgent needs of 117 representative institutions throughout the country. The type and the control of the 117 colleges and universities included in this summary are as follows:

The type and control of the 117 colleges and universities included in this summary are shown below.

Publicly controlled institutions:	
State colleges and universities.....	21
State teachers colleges.....	11
City university.....	1
State colleges for Negroes.....	2
State technical and professional schools.....	4
State junior colleges.....	3
Local (city, county, or district) public junior colleges.....	9
Total.....	51
Privately controlled institutions:	
Coeducational colleges and universities.....	30
Colleges and universities for men.....	10
Colleges for women.....	7
Teachers colleges.....	3
Junior colleges.....	11
Colleges for Negroes.....	3
Technical and professional schools.....	2
Total.....	66

Since the colleges and universities covered in this summary are of all types and kinds, the conditions represented by them may be considered typical of the colleges and universities of the Nation.

On the average each of these institutions will have to refuse admission to 316 veterans and 193 nonveteran students next fall unless they can have help in expanding their facilities. The 117 institutions now anticipate that they will have to turn down a total number of 59,533, of whom 36,972 will be veterans. A Nation-wide estimate derived from the reports of these 117 institutions would be that after all available facilities are filled, there will still be possibly half a million or more applicants who can find admission nowhere.

The factors which make it necessary for these colleges to turn down veterans and other applicants are reported by college officials in the 117 institutions.

1. Lack of housing for married veterans with families is a major factor at 55 institutions, or 47 percent of the total number; an important factor at 7 others; a minor factor at 15 others; no factor at 40 institutions, chiefly women's colleges and colleges accepting only day students.

2. Lack of housing for unmarried students is a major factor at 64 colleges and universities, or 55 percent of the total number; an important factor at 9 others; no factor at 27 institutions, chiefly colleges admitting only day students.

3. Lack of housing for faculty members is a major factor at 44 institutions, or 38 percent of the total number; an important factor at 11 others; a minor factor at 25 others; no factor at 37 institutions, chiefly very small colleges.

4. Lack of educational buildings other than housing is a major factor at 69 institutions, or 59 percent of the total number; an important factor at 15 others; a minor factor at 10 others; no factor at 23 institutions.

I come now to item No. 5, shortage of faculty personnel. This is, I think, very

important, because we have all felt that one of the great shortages would be in faculty personnel.

5. Shortage of faculty personnel is a major factor at 16 institutions, or 14 percent of the total number; an important factor at 13 others; a minor factor at 39 others; no factor at 49 institutions, chiefly small colleges.

Which leads us to believe that housing and school facilities are the most important of all the items necessary for the proper carrying out of the GI educational program.

The needs of the 117 institutions are summarized as follows: 86 have urgent need for dormitories; 85 are in immediate need for classroom space; 81 need housing for faculty members; 79 must have increased laboratory space and equipment; 75 are in need of additional housing units for married students and their families; 72 have immediate need for student union buildings, YMCA halls, or similar centers; 65 are in urgent need of library buildings, and so forth; 36 need additional administrative buildings; 9 must have dining rooms; 7 are in crucial need of infirmary or hospital buildings; 7 need physical education buildings; 6 need assembly halls or chapel buildings; 2 need fine arts buildings, and so forth.

Four colleges of the 117 find that they can classify their building needs as temporary. Forty-two institutions analyze their needs as partly temporary, partly permanent. Sixty-four colleges and universities indicate that their needs are for permanent buildings only, and that temporary buildings would do them no good.

Mr. President, this is such an important document, coming as it does from a reliable source and explaining in detail the needs of the colleges and the institutions reporting, that I ask that it may be made a part of the record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF RALPH McDONALD, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION, THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HEARINGS ON S. 1770 AND S. 2085, MAY 16, 1946

(The National Education Association is the professional organization of individuals engaged in education in the United States. It is the official national body of the State and local education associations in all of the States and Territories, having a dues-paying membership of 733,409, or more than 70 percent of all the educators of America. In addition to these members represented through State and local affiliated associations, the NEA has 331,605 members paying dues direct. NEA membership extends into every State and city and into practically every school, college, and university in the United States. The department of higher education is composed of NEA members engaged in college and university education.)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as you know, we are in continuous touch with college presidents, deans, and professors in every higher education institution in the United States.

On behalf of the organized educators of America I want to give the strongest possible endorsement to the bills now under consideration by your committee, S. 1770 and S. 2085, introduced on April 19, 1946, by Senator

MEAD. We sincerely hope that these measures, with minor amendments, may be passed by Congress before the summer recess.

The committee on veterans' affairs of the department of higher education consists of the following: S. E. Crowe, dean of students, Michigan State College, chairman; C. E. Avery, director, bureau of veterans' affairs, University of Minnesota, vice chairman; E. V. Hollis, principal specialist in higher education, United States Office of Education, consultant; V. W. Adams, assistant director extension division, University of Pittsburgh; K. O. Broadly, director, university extension division, University of Nebraska; E. R. Elbel, director, veterans' service, University of Kansas; W. R. Goetsch, liberal arts advisory office, University of Iowa; R. R. Hamilton, dean, College of Law, University of Wyoming; J. O. Keller, assistant to the president, Pennsylvania State College; John Lane, director of veterans' affairs, University of Notre Dame; Kenneth Little, director, student personnel services, University of Wisconsin; J. St. Clair Price, dean, College of Liberal Arts, Howard University; F. C. Smith, dean, University of Tennessee; Arthur F. Southwick, registrar and director of guidance, College of Wooster; W. C. Toepelman, director of veterans' affairs, University of Colorado; G. E. Vander Beke, coordinator, veterans' affairs, Marquette University.

Problems related to the education of veterans in colleges and universities were the subject of a National Conference held in Chicago on April 11, 12, and 13, 1946, by the Department of Higher Education. The very problems which are now being considered by your Committee were studied intensively during a three-day period by the most representative group of college and university faculty leaders which has been brought together in recent years. Representing every branch of higher education faculties and every type of institution from 44 States and the District of Columbia, the participants in the Conference were highly selected in their various regions and institutions on the basis of their expert knowledge and of their responsibilities in relation to providing for veterans. A list of Conference participants is attached to my statement for the information of the Committee.

These qualified men and women found one problem arising above all others—the need for buildings and facilities to take care of veterans.

From every institution came reports that veterans are proving to be excellent students, and that practically all of the 417,324 now in college are making splendid records. The question before the colleges is: how can we provide for the tremendous number of veterans and other students who are seeking admission?

By March 31, 1946, the Veterans' Administration had received 1,988,169 applications from veterans for educational benefits, and it appears that possibly half of these veterans want to go to college. It is now a conservative estimate that one million veterans will by fall be either in college or actively seeking admission to colleges. A survey made in March 1946 by the Veterans' Administration reveals that there will be available this fall in the 1,686 colleges and universities of the Nation only 243,472 vacancies for all types of students—veterans, high school graduates, and all others. Thus it is certain that with only present facilities available literally hundreds of thousands of veterans will be turned away, not to mention the countless other students who will fail to secure admission.

Practically all the colleges and universities are straining every resource to provide for veterans, but most of the hard-pressed institutions are nearing their wits' end.

It is the unanimous opinion among higher education authorities who have studied the

problem that enrollment demand will be still greater in 1947 and will continue to rise until at least 1950 before leveling off, with a huge enrollment of veterans continuing through 1955. Normal nonveteran enrollment increases will require further expansion of facilities even after the period of GI education is past.

Measures now developing are intended to provide some additional housing, but plant and equipment facilities are far short of the minimum needed. Without adequate classroom, laboratory, library, and other facilities for the total educational program, it will be impossible to provide courses of accredited standards for these veterans.

Faced with these facts, the National Conference after most careful consideration adopted a resolution and began an earnest movement to bring before Congress the need for immediate aid in providing facilities for veterans. Our committees have been in touch with every college and university in the Nation with respect to these matters, and the support of the Mead bills is the most unified and positive stand I have ever known the higher education people of the Nation to take.

Swarthmore College, for example, will have no need for the aid specified in these bills, but President John W. Nason and faculty members at Swarthmore join all the rest of us in the earnest hope that these bills may be passed. "Many (institutions) simply cannot expand their facilities * * * without Government help," writes President Nason. Mrs. Mildred McAfee Horton, president of Wellesley, likewise desires no aid whatever for her institution, but urges passage of these bills as a real need both for veterans to be served in other institutions and as a means of relieving the terrific enrollment pressure on the women's colleges.

On the other hand, many institutions—and this number is literally hundreds—simply cannot meet their needs without Government aid. Most of them have exhausted every resource, and I know of several which are faced with the necessity of dipping into endowment funds—one institution of which I know is by dire necessity on the verge of taking \$500,000 of endowment funds for building purposes.

In order to present the picture of the need as precisely and clearly as possible, I desire to lay before your committee a factual summary of the urgent needs of 117 representative institutions throughout the country as they try to plan for veterans. These data are based upon official reports received this week from the respective institutions.

The type and control of the 117 colleges and universities included in this summary are shown below:

Publicly controlled institutions:	
State colleges and universities.....	21
State teachers colleges.....	11
City university.....	1
State colleges for Negroes.....	2
State technical and professional schools.....	4
State junior colleges.....	3
Local (city, county, or district) public junior colleges.....	9
Total.....	51
Privately controlled institutions:	
Coeducational colleges and universities.....	30
Colleges and universities for men.....	10
Colleges for women.....	7
Teachers colleges.....	3
Junior colleges.....	11
Colleges for Negroes.....	3
Technical and professional schools.....	2
Total.....	66

Since the colleges and universities covered in this summary are of all types and kinds, the conditions represented by them may be

considered typical of the colleges and universities of the Nation.

On the average each of these institutions will have to refuse admission to 316 veterans and 193 nonveteran students next fall unless they can have help in expanding their facilities. The 117 institutions now anticipate that they will have to turn down a total number of 59,533, of whom 36,972 will be veterans. A Nation-wide estimate derived from the reports of these 117 institutions would be that after all available facilities are filled, there will still be possibly half a million or more applicants who can find admission nowhere.

The factors which make it necessary for these colleges to turn down veterans and other applicants are reported by college officials in the 117 institutions.

1. Lack of housing for married veterans with families is a major factor at 55 institutions, or 47 percent of the total number; an important factor at 7 others; a minor factor at 15 others; no factor at 40 institutions, chiefly women's colleges and colleges accepting only day students.

2. Lack of housing for unmarried students is a major factor at 64 colleges and universities, or 55 percent of the total number; an important factor at 9 others; a minor factor at 17 others; no factor at 27 institutions, chiefly colleges admitting only day students.

3. Lack of housing for faculty members is a major factor at 44 institutions, or 38 percent of the total number; an important factor at 11 others; a minor factor at 25 others; no factor at 37 institutions, chiefly very small colleges.

4. Lack of educational buildings other than housing is a major factor at 69 institutions, or 59 percent of the total number; an important factor at 15 others; a minor factor at 10 others; no factor at 23 institutions.

5. Shortage of faculty personnel is a major factor at 16 institutions, or 14 percent of the total number; an important factor at 13 others; a minor factor at 39 others; no factor at 49 institutions, chiefly small colleges.

In connection with the reporting of a shortage of personnel, several institutions indicated that the shortage of faculty members could be solved by the providing of faculty housing.

We have an analysis of the actual items of building and equipment which would enable these 117 institutions to provide for a large number of those who will otherwise fail to secure admission.

The needs of the 117 institutions are summarized as follows, in the order of their frequency:

1. Eighty-six have urgent need for dormitories for a total of 16,033 unmarried students.

2. Eighty-five are in immediate need for classroom space, the minimum requirement being a total of 1,054 additional classrooms.

3. Eighty-one need housing for faculty members, the critical shortage amounting to 1,204 family units.

4. Seventy-nine must have increased laboratory space and equipment, the exact need varying in institutions according to their programs of scientific instruction and their present facilities.

5. Seventy-five are in need of additional housing units for married students and their families, the total acute need at these institutions being 4,738 family units.

6. Seventy-two have immediate need for student union buildings, YMCA halls, or similar centers of student social, religious, and recreational life.

7. Sixty-five are in urgent need of library buildings, or additions and alterations to present libraries to accommodate more students.

8. Thirty-six need additional administrative buildings to enable them to take care of the increased enrollment.

9. Nine must have dining rooms.

10. Seven are in crucial need of infirmary or hospital buildings.

11. Seven need physical education buildings.

12. Six need assembly hall or chapel buildings.

13. Two need fine arts buildings.

14. Two need greenhouses in connection with their research and experimentation.

15. Each of the following is reported as an urgent need by at least one institution: Music building; bookstore; laundry; heating plant; disposal plant, chemistry building; architecture building; textile building; medical school building.

We asked the authorities in each of these institutions to make a careful analysis of each item in their building needs to determine as accurately as possible whether the need is temporary or permanent.

Four colleges of the 117 find that they can classify their building needs as temporary.

Forty-two institutions analyze their needs as partly temporary, partly permanent. In these institutions as a whole the building needs listed are apparently about 90 percent of the permanent sort. Only housing for married veterans is listed as a temporary need in most instances.

Sixty-four colleges and universities indicate that their needs are for permanent buildings only and that temporary buildings would do them no good.

A fundamental question facing your committee in connection with the pending bills is that of the ability of the institution to finance their own building programs to meet the critical need. We have information from the institutions themselves on this point.

One institution is able to finance its entire program of necessary building alone, and is doing so.

Three institutions can finance nearly all of their urgent needs, but not quite all of them.

Nineteen are able to provide up to 50 percent of the cost of their building programs.

Sixty-six others are in position to provide a substantial portion of the cost, but not as much as 50 percent of the amount necessary right now to cover their critical needs.

Eighteen have no funds whatever available with which to provide for buildings which they need badly.

Ten have no acute building needs at present.

We asked the authorities of the colleges included in the survey to consider the extent to which their needs might be met by the provisions of S. 2085. To make such an estimate was very difficult, because several colleges could easily have their eyes on the same surplus Government building, whereas only one could possibly have it. Also, in many instances the college authorities are so far away from the buildings which might be made available that they can only assume that a building of the type they need might be available.

Nevertheless, the studied opinions of the college authorities themselves on this point may be of some value to the committee.

Four institutions, in the opinion of their authorities, could have their building needs fully met by the transfer of such Government-owned buildings.

Sixty-four institutions might be able to obtain some measure of assistance from this source. In these 64 institutions the officials consider the extent of such assistance to be quite limited in its possibilities, but are anxious that the full measure of relief from that direction be authorized. They feel that the proposal is sound and constructive.

Sixteen institutions would be able to derive little assistance, if any at all, through the provisions of S. 2085, in the opinion of their officials.

Eleven colleges have needs which their authorities consider it wholly impossible to

meet, even in part, by the transporting and remodeling of surplus Government buildings.

On the efficacy of the provision of S. 1770, however, there is no question whatever.

Eighty-three institutions would receive just the kind of assistance under S. 1770 which they need to move forward with all their urgent building needs.

Twenty-five additional institutions would be able to proceed with an important part of their critical building programs if they had the benefits of S. 1770 available to them.

The real question before your committee is this: If S. 1770 and S. 2085 are enacted into law, will college opportunities be available to a greater number of veterans than would otherwise be able to enter college?

We asked the officials of the institutions to give the most reliable estimate possible of the number of additional veteran students—over and beyond the number they will admit without these aids—they would be able to provide for if the two bills now pending before your committee are adopted.

Official estimates from the 117 institutions indicate that they can and will accommodate next year, 1946-47, a total of 23,156 additional veterans if they can have immediately the assistance provided by these bills. They indicate that they would expect to provide for 6,861 of these additional veterans under the provisions of S. 2085, and the others under the provisions of S. 1770.

Since time would be required for building, even if these bills are passed and implemented immediately, the number of additional veterans to be accommodated would be considerably greater the following year, the number for 1947-48 being estimated as 30,093, of whom 7,766 would be accommodated under the provisions of S. 2085.

Thus, if we may reliably generalize on the basis of these data from 117 representative institutions, it seems reasonable to conclude that the immediate passage and quick implementation of the pending measures, S. 2085 and S. 1770, with building materials and equipment for these purposes given priority, would enable the colleges and universities to provide for 282,390 additional veteran students in 1946-47, for 366,951 additional veteran students in 1947-48, for 416,902 additional veteran students in 1948-49, and for 437,695 additional veteran students in 1949-50.

It is certainly valid and reasonable to say that practically all of these students will otherwise be seeking in vain to secure admission to college.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, Mr. Wyatt, Administrator of the National Housing Agency, wrote a letter to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] commenting on the bill, suggesting amendments, and otherwise offering some very excellent suggestions. In the letter, Mr. Wyatt made this comment:

S. 2085, introduced on April 19, would enable the Federal Works Administrator to provide needed educational facilities, other than housing, through the use or reuse of surplus structures or facilities under the jurisdiction or control of any Federal agency. I am entirely in accord with the purposes of this bill. The right of veterans to educational opportunities requires the expansion of other facilities besides housing, and these should certainly be made available. Since the bill sets forth a program outside the scope of the National Housing Agency, I shall not comment upon the detailed methods which the bill sets forth to obtain its objective. With the objective I am in hearty agreement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,

Washington, D. C., May 16, 1946.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: In view of the hearings commencing today on S. 2085, S. 1770, and the amendments to S. 1770 introduced on April 19, all sponsored by Senator MEAD, I should like to present the following suggestions:

S. 2085, introduced on April 19, would enable the Federal Works Administrator to provide needed educational facilities, other than housing, through the use or reuse of surplus structures or facilities under the jurisdiction or control of any Federal agency. I am entirely in accord with the purposes of this bill. The right of veterans to educational opportunities requires the expansion of other facilities besides housing, and these should certainly be made available. Since the bill sets forth a program outside the scope of the National Housing Agency, I shall not comment upon the detailed methods which the bill sets forth to obtain its objective. With the objective I am in hearty agreement.

If S. 2085 should be approved, I recommend that the following provision be inserted at the end of section 504:

"(d) Nothing in this section 504 shall affect the transfer to the National Housing Administrator of any structures or facilities requisitioned by him pursuant to section 502 (b) of this act, for housing for veterans and distressed families of servicemen prior to any request therefor made by the Federal Works Administrator pursuant to the authority contained in said section 504."

S. 1770, introduced on January 28, would authorize the National Housing Administrator to provide housing for persons attending educational institutions under the GI bill of rights. In effect, this bill would authorize the Administrator to provide new temporary or permanent public housing of any type for such persons. We in the National Housing Agency do not feel that new temporary public housing should be authorized at this time. Rather we feel that provision of temporary housing should be limited to the re-use program already in effect under title V of the Lanham Act. With regard to permanent public housing, we are not in favor of a program of new Federal construction, but feel instead that the Wagner-Elender-Taft bill (S. 1592) provides a decentralized public-housing program broad enough to cover the needs in educational institutions, both for family units and for dormitories. This bill has already passed the Senate. Further, other provisions of S. 1592 contain very liberal methods for the private financing of housing at educational institutions. Therefore, we suggest that S. 1770 as introduced on January 28 is in principle less desirable than satisfactory legislation which has already been approved by the Senate, and which is in accord with our general approach to the problem of public housing.

The amendments to S. 1770, introduced on April 19, contain in section 605 an authorization to the Federal Works Administrator to make loans and grants to educational institutions serving veterans under the GI Act, which would enable these institutions to construct and equip educational facilities (including dormitories). This would supplement the re-use program contemplated under S. 2085 with a new construction program. I regard such a program as necessary and desirable, and since it would come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, I shall not comment upon the details of achieving this laudable objective. However, I believe that this program as authorized under these S. 1770 amendments of April 19

should be concentrated upon facilities other than housing, and should not include dormitories without limitation. I believe it entirely sound, and in accord with views already adopted by the Senate, that any programming or provision of housing facilities, whether dormitories or family units, should be concentrated mainly within the National Housing Agency and not divided between two Federal agencies. If it proves desirable in any particular instance to utilize the facilities of the Federal Works Agency for housing purposes, the National Housing Administrator may do so by delegation. (However, there may be cases where dormitories for educational institutions are so integrated with their other facilities that Federal aid for the expansion thereof should be concentrated within the Federal Works Agency.) With this one change, I favor these S. 1770 amendments of April 19.

If the committee finds merit in my suggestions, they could be accomplished as follows:

S. 1770, as introduced on January 28, should be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the provisions contained in section 605 of the amendments to S. 1770 introduced on April 19. In these amendments of April 19, however, the words "including dormitories" appearing on line 4 of page 2 should be changed to read "including dormitories after consultation with the National Housing Agency." Also, the title of S. 1770 as introduced on January 28 should be changed by striking out the word "housing" in the fourth line of such title and inserting in lieu thereof the words "educational facilities and dormitories."

Because of their interest I am sending copies of this letter to Senator MEAD, Senator ELLENDER, and Senator TAFT.

In view of my desire to get these recommendations before the committee on time for the hearings today, the foregoing recommendations have not yet been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

WILSON W. WYATT,
Administrator.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, there was also presented to the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor a statement by Dr. John W. Studebaker, of the United States Office of Education, commenting upon the bill. The statement was read by Mr. Kelly of the United States Office of Education. From the statement I read the following:

Within the last few weeks the Office of Education has had occasion to query a representative sampling of American colleges and universities concerning types of services which the Office might provide in helping the institutions to meet their current educational problems. A large proportion of the replies listed housing, either for instructional or for dormitory purposes, as the major problem. As a follow-up, the Office of Education on April 24 sent the following message to the heads of 50 institutions of higher education of all types.

Forty-eight replies were received, and 46 of the institutions stated that they had urgent need of additional dormitories to house large numbers of veterans applying for admission. Forty had building plans ready. Each of 23 of the institutions required accommodations for fewer than 500 additional students. Each of 8 others needed space for between 500 and 1,000. Eight needed to take care of between 1,000 and 1,500 each, and 8 more were each in need of living quarters for more than 1,500 students. One of these last 8, unless Federal assistance is available, states that it will have no accommodations for 3,000 applicants this fall.

Thirty-four of the institutions replied that they could not build a single dormitory without Federal aid. Four said they could, and six said they could build partially, but not completely. Practically all could let contracts for construction almost at once, if provided with priorities assistance, and grants and loans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Studebaker's statement with reference to the two bills printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN W. STUDEBAKER, UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, MAY 16, 1946

I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before this committee to present certain facts known to the United States Office of Education on the problems of increased enrollment, overcrowding, and need for additional buildings for both instructional and dwelling purposes in our American institutions of higher education.

Peak enrollment in colleges and universities in the fall of 1939 was approximately 1,360,000 students. Studies of current trends show that we may expect about 1,600,000 or 1,700,000 students to be enrolled in the fall of 1946, and that enrollments will not go below this figure in succeeding years. This is a very conservative estimate, and the likelihood is that it will be exceeded. What it means is that our colleges will have to absorb at least three or four hundred thousand more students than were in attendance a few years ago. And since the student body next fall will include several hundred thousand veterans, considerably older than the average student has been in the past, our institutions of higher education, and the communities in which they are located, will be confronted with the problem of finding a place to live for a large number of wives and children. Rooms and apartments that used to be available in college towns and cities are no longer available. The tight housing squeeze throughout America is too well known to need further elaboration here. It is clear that without some sort of assistance to colleges and universities, serious overcrowding and a dangerous drop in standards of living and of education may become the regular fare we shall be offering veterans and our young people.

Reports coming to the Office of Education from all over the country indicate a pretty standard pattern with regard to this problem. In institution after institution, present facilities are being taxed to the utmost, and colleges are being forced to turn away thousands of veterans and other students who are seeking admission. This applies not only to liberal arts or other undergraduate work but also to professional or graduate schools of all types. And anyone who has visited a few colleges recently knows at once that colleges and universities are overcrowded, not only in their dormitories but also in their classrooms and laboratories, beyond anything they have ever before experienced. The fact that practically all educational construction was halted during the war means also that educational institutions have fallen behind in their building programs.

Within the last few weeks the Office of Education has had occasion to query a representative sampling of American colleges and universities concerning types of services which the Office might provide in helping the institutions to meet their current educational problems. A large proportion of the replies listed housing, either for instructional or for dormitory purposes, as the major problem.

As a follow-up, the Office of Education on April 24 sent the following message to the heads of 50 institutions of higher education of all types:

"Consideration being given to including dormitories in Federal public-works program. Please wire collect answers to following questions: 1. Do you have urgent need for additional dormitories? 2. Do you have plans for such buildings? 3. For how many students? 4. Can you build them soon without Federal aid? 5. How soon could contract be let if Government provided priorities for scarce materials and half the cost and, if necessary, loan for balance?"

Forty-eight replies were received, and 46 of the institutions stated that they had urgent need of additional dormitories to house large numbers of veterans applying for admission. Forty had building plans ready. Each of 23 of the institutions required accommodations for fewer than 500 additional students. Each of 8 others needed space for between 500 and 1,000. Eight needed to take care of between 1,000 and 1,500 each, and 8 more were each in need of living quarters for more than 1,500 students. One of these last 8, unless Federal assistance is available, states that it will have no accommodations for 3,000 applicants this fall.

Thirty-four of the institutions replied that they could not build a single dormitory without Federal aid. Four said they could, and six said they could build partially, but not completely. Practically all could let contracts for construction almost at once, if provided with priorities assistance and grants and loans.

It is obvious to anyone that a serious problem exists which requires prompt attention. Devices to work out the problem will have to be considered and studied very carefully. If the solution decided upon calls for Federal assistance, the technical problems involved in establishing relationships and defining specific responsibilities of Federal government, State educational agencies, and the institutions themselves will require painstaking care. In a situation of this sort, where a certain degree of need probably exists on almost every campus in the country, and where assistance will be available for only a selected number of institutions, determining the exact extent of need at a given institution and then establishing a priority of needs among various institutions will call for a highly skilled group of technicians, familiar with the technicalities of college teaching schedules, with enrollment problems, and with methods of building utilization, and with the problems of general educational administration. Whatever arrangements are decided upon for placing this responsibility, adequate provision must be made for an appropriate staff to perform this most essential task of determining fairly and accurately the extent of essential need for each institution.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, another witness appeared before the committee, whose statement was very effective, and I shall read a portion of it. Testimony was presented to the committee by A. J. Brumbaugh, vice president of the American Council on Education. Among other things Mr. Brumbaugh said:

The provision for housing an increased number of students has, however, created another problem. It has created a shortage of physical facilities in addition to housing—a shortage of classrooms, laboratories, study rooms, gymnasiums, and dining rooms. There is now no adequate provision to transport temporary structure to meet these needs.

He proceeds to recommend and strongly endorses Senate bill 2085.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Brumbaugh's statement printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF A. J. BRUMBAUGH, VICE PRESIDENT AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, MAY 16, 1946

HOUSING

The American Council on Education is an organization of educational associations and institutions. It is composed of 64 national and regional educational organizations and 782 institutional members comprising universities, colleges, teachers colleges, junior colleges, State departments of education, and city school systems.

Institutions of higher education are deeply appreciative of the concern of this committee and the Congress in assisting them to meet the needs of veterans. The appropriations totaling almost \$500,000,000 under the Lanham Act have made it possible for many institutions to accept students considerably in excess of their 1939-40 enrollment. One State university, for example, already has enrollment one-third above its prewar peak, and anticipates an enrollment twice as large as that of 1939-40 at the opening of college this fall. This situation can be duplicated in all of the larger and better known institutions in the United States. But the pressure of maximum enrollments is now also reaching into the smaller institutions.

The provision for housing an increased number of students has, however, created another problem. It has created a shortage of physical facilities in addition to housing—a shortage of classrooms, laboratories, study rooms, gymnasiums, and dining rooms. There is now no adequate provision to transport temporary structures to meet these needs.

Not all institutions will need these additional facilities, for in many of them the greater demand is being met by more continuous use of existing facilities. But there are some which are already using classrooms and laboratories from 8 a. m. to 10 p. m., 6 days a week, yet are still unable to accept additional students because of the lack of instructional space.

It is because of this fact that the American Council's Committee on the Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government, at its meeting on May 5, 1946, strongly endorsed S. 2085. The membership of this committee includes the following distinguished educators: Chancellor Harry W. Chase, New York University, chairman; President James B. Conant, Harvard University; President Carter Davidson, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.; Rev. Edward V. Stanford, Augustinian College, Washington, D. C.; President Raymond Walters, University of Cincinnati; President Herman B. Wells, Indiana University; President Roscoe L. West, State Teachers College, Trenton, N. J.; Dr. George F. Zook, president, American Council on Education, ex officio.

They recommend the quick passage of this legislation and propose only one amendment to the bill as it is now worded. This amendment would make provision for reimbursing institutions for expenditures of their own funds incurred in transporting and erecting temporary structures. This provision for refund was incorporated in the appropriation for title 5 of the Lanham Act, and it is our judgment that it should be carried over into the proposed new title embodied in S. 2085.

The Committee on Relationships took no action on S. 1770, but rather has submitted a poll to college and university presidents, to procure their judgment on this legislation which would provide grants-in-aid to both publicly and privately controlled institutions for permanent housing. This latter bill, S. 1770, involves the fundamental principle of Federal grants to privately controlled edu-

ucational institutions for permanent facilities, and as such it was the opinion of the committee that our action should await the expressed judgment of leaders in higher education throughout the United States. In closing these brief remarks, may I again commend the committee and the Congress for the effective way in which you have responded, and for the invaluable assistance you have given to the colleges and universities. It is this kind of cooperation between Government and higher education that is making it possible for our colleges and universities to meet the demand resulting from the generous provisions of the Congress for veterans' education.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, just one more statement, and then I shall conclude. I have a report from Col. F. Russell Lyons, colonel, GSC, Chief, Installation Branch, Services Group, ASF, a memorandum with respect to surplus buildings available for disposal. It states the surplus buildings, by States, which are available for disposal and to become available for disposal during the remainder of the calendar year. It is very interesting to note that wherever there is need for a number of buildings in a given State the military has more than that number of buildings in the same State. They are buildings which can very well be used for engineering laboratories, for administration buildings, for classrooms, for laboratories, and for the other purposes for which our universities and colleges stand in need of buildings. Altogether, Mr. President, a total of 32,308 such buildings are surplus now, and there will be 3,048 additional buildings surplus in the third quarter of 1946, and 672 additional buildings surplus in the last quarter of 1946.

So, Mr. President, we have the buildings, and they are located in our military training centers for the most part. Colleges and universities, many of them located at a short distance from the military training centers, have a very pressing need for those buildings. If we are to educate the veterans and carry out the responsibility which is ours, if we are going to meet the obligations under the GI bill of rights, then, Mr. President, all we have to do is to approve the proposed legislation upon which I have just commented, which will authorize the Federal Works Agency to take down and transport and erect these buildings on the campuses of the universities, and in addition to that, by a system of loans and grants, aid the colleges and the universities in the extension and enlargement of existing buildings and in the construction of new buildings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum from Colonel Lyons be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorandum for Brig. Gen. T. M. Osborne, Deputy Director, Supply Group

Subject: Surplus buildings available for disposal.

1. Reference is made to your informal request for a list, by States, of surplus War Department buildings available for disposal. It is understood that this list is to be used by the Mead committee in their study of

the disposal of surplus War Department installations.

2. Accompanying this memorandum is a list showing the number of surplus buildings, by States, available for disposal and to become available for disposal during the balance of the calendar year. No attempt has been made in this estimate to separate the buildings into types and categories. The numbers of buildings are based on an estimate of 400 buildings for 10,000-man capacity in posts, camps, and prisoner-of-war camps, and 60 buildings for a 1,000-bed hospital. Installations transferred or scheduled to be transferred to the Veterans' Administration and buildings transferred to the Federal Public Housing Administration are not included in this list.

3. This estimate, compiled rapidly on the basis of capacity, is necessarily an approximation. The several service commands will be directed to compile and forward accurate counts of surplus buildings within their command by types and categories. These data will not be available prior to May 23, 1946. Advice is desired concerning the amount of time available before these accurate figures will be required for your conferences.

F. RUSSELL LYONS,

Colonel, GSC, Chief, Installation Branch, Services Group, ASF.

Surplus buildings available for disposal

State	Surplus now or prior to June 30, 1946	To be surplus in third quarter, 1946	To be surplus in fourth quarter, 1946
Alabama.....	1,141		
Arizona.....	373		
Arkansas.....	680		
California.....	1,963	105	
Colorado.....	388		
Connecticut.....			38
Delaware.....	79		
Florida.....	1,137		
Georgia.....	1,208		
Idaho.....	140		
Illinois.....	467	165	
Indiana.....	38		
Iowa.....	402		
Kansas.....	1,439		
Kentucky.....			
Louisiana.....	3,937		
Maine.....			
Maryland.....	188	45	
Massachusetts.....	57		147
Michigan.....			
Minnesota.....			
Mississippi.....	4,419		
Missouri.....	496	829	
Montana.....			
Nebraska.....	142	200	
Nevada.....			
New Hampshire.....			
New Jersey.....	161		
New Mexico.....	437		136
New York.....	685	1,699	80
North Carolina.....	976		175
North Dakota.....			
Ohio.....	50		
Oklahoma.....	567		
Oregon.....	1,414		
Pennsylvania.....	23		196
Rhode Island.....	26		
South Carolina.....	1,360		
South Dakota.....			
Tennessee.....	1,711		
Texas.....	5,432		
Utah.....	45		
Vermont.....			
Virginia.....	91		
Washington.....	321		
West Virginia.....	356		
Wisconsin.....			
Wyoming.....			
Total.....	32,308	3,043	672

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Chair appoints the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] as members of the Joint Committee on the Library to fill existing vacancies.

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDI-
TURES, 1946**

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair appoints the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] as the members of the Special Committee To Investigate Senatorial Campaign Contributions and Expenditures in the 1946 Elections, created by Senate Resolution 224, agreed to on the calendar day of April 1, 1946.

ORDERS FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. **BARKLEY.** I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

**PRODUCTION OF SUGARS AND SIRUPS IN
ALCOHOL PLANTS—REPORT OF COM-
MITTEE ON FINANCE**

Mr. **GEORGE.** Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162) extending for 7 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol, and I submit a report (No. 1361) thereon. This joint resolution was introduced earlier today by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and myself.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

MEDIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4908) to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes.

Mr. **KILGORE.** Mr. President, unlike some of my colleagues, I wish to speak today for just a few minutes about the man who has not so far been discussed on the floor of the Senate—the common garden variety of coal miner who digs the coal under the ground and puts it on the car.

The soft coal shut-down has presented to the people of America one of the most tragic and bitter paradoxes of our times.

The atomic age may be just around the corner; but the fact remains that we are now living in the coal age.

Our economy, indeed our entire civilization, crucially depends upon continued production of coal.

Without coal, and, without the labor of the men who produce it, our mills, our factories, our ships, our trains, and our public utilities become still and silent. In fact, even our women folk go without stockings; those of us who suffer from diabetes go without saccharin; and those who suffer with headaches go without aspirin.

Coal makes the rest of our national enterprise productive. Without it our entire economy bogs down into helplessness.

Yet, strangely enough we take coal—this vital key to enterprise and production—as a matter of course, as something that just happens, until the source is cut off.

It is not like oil from an oil well, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]. When an oil well is drilled and cleaned out, the oil flows, or a pump is used to pump it out. In the case of coal, it is just as though we had to go to the bottom of an oil well with a bucket and bail out every gallon which flowed into the well.

Mr. President, I represent the Nation's largest bituminous coal producing State, and, I know from the tragic experiences of the men living in my own home county that coal is not afforded to man on a silver platter as is all too often thought, and as has been all too often represented on the floor of the Senate. It comes only with the sweat and blood of man—only through the grim, health-destroying, bone-breaking toil of the miner.

It is indeed tragic that while there is no type of labor more indispensable to our economy, there are few occupations more fraught with danger, more decimated by willful negligence and gross neglect of safety.

The coal miner is indispensable to our economy; yet we permit cutthroat employers to exploit him to the utmost. We permit the development of a condition not unlike that which caused the revolution in Ireland. We permit the existence of a condition much similar to that which caused us to shed so many tears over the share croppers and Southern cotton workers, and to enact legislation to cure those evils. We permit many absentee landlords—landlords more interested in profits than the welfare of their employees—to exploit the coal miners; yet many people heap words of scorn upon miners when they strike for better living and working conditions.

Mr. President, there are many coal operators who want to help the miners. We found a paradoxical situation in the county adjoining my home county, in which one operator who had built a railroad bridge to give an outlet to the coal from his mines, which bridge also was used by other operators in the same field, endeavored to enjoin other operators from the use of the bridge because of their bad practices. He was not a "peanut" operator. He was one of the largest operators in the State, a splendid man, who did not want to cut the wages below a decent living standard. He did not want to abuse his men. He went to the courts to try to prevent companies which did exploit their men from using the bridge, which his money had built, to get their coal to market.

There are many coal operators who want to improve living conditions in the mining towns. There are many coal operators who want to improve working conditions in the mines. But their hands are tied by the unscrupulous, powerful, well-financed cutthroat operators more interested in profit than the welfare of their workers.

These operators have plagued the coal industry—and I am speaking from a production viewpoint—by waging price

wars reducing prices but maintaining profits at the expense of the coal miner, and sometimes at the expense of the purveyor who furnishes mine supplies and groceries; and also by spot coal shipments, in which the coal sometimes lays on a siding until it sells for 50 cents a ton.

The operator who wants to help his men is forced to string along with the cutthroat operators or face bankruptcy.

Congress, while debating labor laws, has been negligent for 2 years in permitting the continuation of these conditions.

Several years ago a bill, commonly known as the Guffey coal bill, was passed for a 2-year period. It was extended once, but when it came up for its second extension it was pigeonholed in a committee in the House of Representatives. This bill—eliminating price wars—has been collecting dust for almost 18 months.

I ask, how many members of the committee which pigeonholed that bill, which would enable the operator to bargain and fix wages, come from coal-producing States?

Congress can and must help the miner and the mining industry by passing the Guffey coal bill.

In meeting the cutthroat competition many coal operators have operated under a system which denies the miners the ordinary safety which other industries furnish their workers.

The miner is forced, by necessity, to live near the source of coal.

The coal miners in my own home county of Raleigh County, W. Va., have a living standard much higher than that in other soft-coal-producing areas, yet those conditions are pitiful in comparison with the condition of workers in the average company-owned town in other industries.

In many coal-mining towns everything is owned by absentee landlords who have done virtually nothing, in many cases, to help their unfortunate employees.

This is true not only in West Virginia, but in other coal-producing States.

Mr. President, I have before me copies of newspaper articles on this subject. These are not propaganda articles. They were prepared and written by reporters of conservative newspapers such as the Washington Evening Star and the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent to have these articles printed in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks. I shall quote from some of them in my address, but I believe that the entire articles should appear in the *RECORD*, and I ask unanimous consent at this time to have them printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. **KILGORE.** Mr. James Y. Newton, of the Evening Star, wrote:

In the field of things that affect the everyday lives of its workers, the coal industry has done its worst job on housing. Much of it is atrocious.

He used the word "atrocious." I believe no one will deny that the Washing-

ton Evening Star is a conservative newspaper.

The coal-mining towns are bleak, desolate towns. In too many cases miners and their families must live in company-owned, grim, downtrodden shacks.

Mrs. Agnes Meyer, of the Washington Post, went into the coal fields and found living conditions "deplorable," to use her own word.

She wrote:

The miners need a chance to live like human beings.

Yes; they need a chance to live like ordinary, decent Americans in other industries.

Mrs. Meyer also wrote:

They need a chance to escape from the pigsties they are forced to inhabit. They need health instead of filthy water supplies, unsanitary toilets, bad odors, flies, mosquitoes, and the diseases that result from them. They must be assured a living wage. They are entitled to safe working conditions instead of being forced to walk daily into death traps.

In her article written in Harlan, Ky., May 7, she stated:

I have been through the bituminous coal areas of the Appalachian Mountains, where the fatalities read like battle reports from Iwo Jima.

Mr. President, I regret to say that she did not exaggerate.

I wonder how many Members of this body have ever been around a mine when a great explosion occurred? I have had that sad experience on three occasions. I have seen women come to the mouth of the mine with their children, knowing that their husbands were underground, and not knowing whether they were coming back alive, crippled, or dead—not knowing what was going to happen to them. There have been mine disasters in which more than 300 people have lost their lives. I regret to say that Mrs. Meyer did not exaggerate.

When we think of coal for our furnaces, coal for electric lights, coal for transportation, coal to keep our industries in operation, we do not think of the men working 3 or 4, or even 6 miles underground.

The public does not see the conditions which make mine fatalities, as Mrs. Meyer wrote, read like battle reports from Iwo Jima. How many people realize that during the past 40 years the number of outright deaths from all causes averaged almost 2,000 annually? How many people realize that the number injured from 1930 to 1944 totaled almost 67,000 a year, out of 400,000 employed in the mines? How many people realize that the total number of disabled, partially disabled, and temporarily disabled from 1930 to 1944 was 1,004,624, in addition to the number killed, which was 28,000? How many people realize that during normal times most of the coal companies will not employ a man over 45 years of age? That practice is usually followed only in the case of deep-sea divers, caisson workers, and a few other workers who are paid extremely high wages.

How many of the people who are criticizing the miners are willing, know-

ing those facts, to go into the mines and work under present conditions?

Mr. President, how long are we going to permit the continuation of such conditions?

I am not speaking to the operators and I am not speaking to the miners. I am speaking to the Members of the United States Congress, and particularly to the Members of the United States Senate.

I realize that for what I am about to suggest I shall be accused of trying to violate States' rights; but I wonder how long we can stand by and permit so many people in a single industry to be killed and injured.

I have walked through the entries of mines in which coal dust was above my shoe tops; and coal dust is the most destructive explosive that existed up until the invention of atomic fission.

I ask those who are so eager to exorcise the miner because he strikes in demand of better living and working conditions whether they are willing to go down into the mines day after day and year after year and subject themselves to an occupation which has taken such a heavy toll in human life.

Several years ago a bill was introduced in Congress to create a Federal Mine Inspection Department. That bill, like the other bill I have mentioned, was held in a committee in the House of Representatives for over 3 years. Finally, the United States Senate forced it to conference, where it passed. I give the Senate full credit for its action in that connection. But the bill was not enacted until it had been written so as to give only the right of inspection, but not the right to enforce a standardization of safety laws and practices.

In such a highly competitive industry, is it wise to leave the safety of human beings in the hands of varying standards? Or is it better to have the standards prepared and supervised by a Federal agency composed of experts who know mining—experts who will not permit human life to be sacrificed for the benefit of profit alone.

In virtually every major industry affecting the economy and welfare of our great Nation we have recognized the need for adequate safety standards; yet, in the coal industry—the key to our national enterprise and production—we permit mine fatalities to read—as Mrs. Meyer has said—like battle reports from Iwo Jima.

There are safety standards for the railroads, to protect the crews and the cargo. They are Federal standards; and, incidentally, they are strictly enforced by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and we must admit that the Commission does a very good job.

Once more the anti-labor lobby has rushed into the Halls of Congress with cries for action now.

This is the time for action. But to blindly rush into anti-labor legislation at this time fits only the schemes of the powerful, well-financed anti-labor lobby.

Congress must act in a constructive manner. Would a surgeon paint the surface of the skin to remove a tumor, or would he get to the source of the

tumor and cut it out? Congress can no longer shirk its duty to the coal miner. It is the duty of Congress to guarantee the safety and health of workers in an industry as basic as coal mining. By doing so Congress will be taking a long-needed, constructive step toward improving conditions in the mining industry, and it will be taking a constructive step toward minimizing disputes in that vital industry.

If this be a violation of State rights, what do Senators say about a law prohibiting or limiting the manner in which citizens of various States may deal with their employers? If one trespasses on the rights of the States, certainly the same is true of the other.

In the final analysis, Mr. President, we have but two alternatives:

First, we can leave the enforcement of mining standards and practices in the hands of the individual States. But if we are to accept this premise, is it unreasonable to say that we also should ask the individual States to handle mine disputes? If one is a matter of States' rights, so is the other.

The second alternative is this: We can put teeth into the Federal mine-safety bill by affording the Bureau of Mines the authority it needs to enforce its recommendations.

In view of past history, I firmly believe that the latter course is the only course that will provide the necessary improvements in mine-safety procedure.

Let me say that I do not believe we should abolish the State inspection systems. I think that they, in connection with a good Federal system, would produce desirable conditions in the mines, because certainly a double check is not too much to make in the face of such conditions and in the interest of those who work in such an explosive atmosphere.

I propose an amendment to the Federal mine-safety bill giving the Bureau of Mines the authority to enforce its recommendations regarding mining standards and practices.

By way of explanation, let me say that this amendment in no way tends to supersede agreements reached by labor and management regarding compliance with the Federal mine-safety laws.

The purpose of this amendment is clear; it puts teeth into the Federal mine-safety bill.

One of my colleagues from West Virginia, Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coal, of the Mines and Mining Committee of the House, is working on another approach to this problem; and I have every reason to believe that a conference will enable Congress to draft an adequate measure to enforce the mine-safety laws.

But, Mr. President, before we try to use pressure and coercion and methods of that type, I think we had better remove the source of the sore spot, by enacting legislation which is demanded by the situation.

The need is great. This is the time for action.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall offer as a substitute for the pending measure

an amendment to the Mine Safety Act. I shall offer it as an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The amendment is intended as a substitute for the Case bill, and not as an amendment to it.

It is clear that the Senate has set aside other more urgent business in order to consider labor legislation because of the occurrence of the coal dispute. We can make no contribution toward industrial stability by passing hastily drawn, if not ill-conceived, over-all labor legislation directed against workers who have exercised their fundamental right of refusing to remain on jobs under conditions which they find intolerable. Since the plight of the coal miners has brought to the attention of the whole country the hazardous and unsafe conditions which too often prevail in coal mining, the Senate has an opportunity to eliminate one of the causes of the present dispute by putting teeth into the Federal Government's mine-safety inspection law. Immediate action on the proposed mine-safety substitute bill will remedy one of the causes of the coal dispute, and thus will be a lasting contribution to peaceful relations in this basic industry.

Mr. President, let me also say that if the House of Representatives will wake up and if the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives will get on its toes and report the Coal Stabilization Act, so that the decent operators—and there are many of them—can safely deal with their employees and can be sure that they will not suffer as a result of the actions of the cutthroat operators who are willing to operate below cost, at the expense of the miners, we shall eliminate another one of the causes of the coal strike, and we shall do so by means of appropriate and proper legislation which the Constitution contemplates that the Congress of the United States shall consider and, if it deems wise to do so, shall enact.

We should make progress in that way, and not by the passage of, let me say, some kind of a bill of attainder aimed at an individual—as some of the speeches which have been made would indicate that some Member of the Congress might attempt to have passed.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. KILGORE to the bill (H. R. 4908) to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes, is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That the first section of the act entitled 'An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes,' approved May 7, 1941, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(f) For the purpose of obtaining such information as may be necessary or appropriate for prescribing regulations pursuant to section 13 and for the administration and enforcement of such regulations."

"Sec. 2. Such act of May 7, 1941, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 13. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized to prescribe rea-

sonable regulations establishing standards and requirements necessary and appropriate for the prevention or amelioration of unhealthy or unsafe conditions, accidents, or occupational diseases in coal mines the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce. Such regulations may provide, among other things, that the operations of any such mine shall be suspended in whole or in part upon the order of a coal-mine inspector if he finds in such mine an unsafe or unhealthy condition which is specified in such regulations as a ground for such suspension.

"(b) At least 30 days prior to the issuance of any regulation under this section or any amendment to such a regulation, notice of the proposed regulation or amendment shall be published in the Federal Register and shall include either the terms or a statement of the substance of the proposed regulation or amendment. Not less than 15 days after the publication of such notice, interested persons shall be afforded an opportunity to submit, orally or in writing, data, views, and arguments with respect to such proposed regulation or amendment. All relevant matter so presented shall be given consideration, and such regulation or amendment shall, before issuance, be revised to the extent which the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Mines, deems necessary and appropriate in the light of such matter.

"(c) Whoever violates the provisions of any regulation prescribed pursuant to this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(d) Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Mines, any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any regulation prescribed pursuant to this section, the Secretary may make application to the appropriate court for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such regulation, and upon showing that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order may be granted without bond."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for requiring compliance with safety regulations in coal mines."

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Star of April 28, 1946]
ATROCIOUS HOUSING IS WORST FEATURE OF MINING INDUSTRY—BOTH OWNERS AND MEN BLAMED FOR CONDITIONS UNDERLYING ECONOMIC CAUSES ANALYZED

(By James Y. Newton)

In the field of things that affect the everyday lives of its workers, the coal industry has done its worst job on housing. Much of it is atrocious. That is true, at least, in the wide area covered by our survey.

And by using the term "coal industry" we do not mean to imply that those who operate the mines should bear sole responsibility for the situation. They must share a large part of it. But in many instances the miners themselves are to blame, at least for the dirty interiors of their houses. John L. Lewis' union should be criticized, too, for there seemed much that organization could do in educating its members in the better ways of living.

Then there is the way this business of producing coal is run. In much of the territory we covered the mining companies do not own the land where they operate. They lease it long-term from the owning land companies, build the house and develop the mine, giving the land companies from 10 to 15 cents in royalties on every ton of coal mined.

When the coal runs out or the operator goes broke, as is frequently the case except in boom times such as these, the houses revert to the land company. They are not torn down. The houses continue to be inhabited until they fall down around the ears of the occupants—or so it seemed to us after observing a number of camps at abandoned mines.

This system does not encourage the building of sound houses or repairs after they are erected. There seemed to be a lively business in the sale of shacks at worked-out mines. There is a housing shortage in the coal fields too. It makes quite a problem for the community and those coal operators who are trying to improve living conditions.

The Norfolk and Western and Virginian Railroads have tremendous holdings of coal land in southern West Virginia. They get a two-way pull on the coal operator—the royalty and the charge for hauling the coal to market. The two are high on the list of the Nation's most profitable railroads.

Generally speaking, the quality of mine housing varied with the prosperity of the coal company. Those companies operating in thick seams of coal do well financially, and the houses of their camps more often than not reflected that fact. Thin-seamed, marginal mines have a hard job of making ends meet even in good times, and their houses showed it. Before the war, coal mining generally was a losing proposition. Mine workers admit conditions have improved the past 10 years, but they said things can be made so much better than they are.

FIND 25 PERCENT HOVELS

It seemed to us, after viewing more than a hundred mining camps in West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia, that about 25 percent of the houses are good, 50 percent in a state of needing various degrees of improvement, and 25 percent definitely bad hovels.

Many houses do not have running water, and a bathroom is a luxury in most places. Nearly all appeared to have electricity. Company-owned houses predominate in the areas visited, although some mine workers were said to be building homes of their own. The topography of the coal country limits this trend. Good building sites are few, what with the masses of mountains and V-shaped valleys and a railroad track down the middle.

It was a source of some amazement to us that some of the houses, perched precariously on steep mountainsides, did not tumble off. We mentioned our concern to Charles Kiser, United Mine Workers representative at Williamson, W. Va.

"Well, it just happened," he said. "A house toppled off on a hill at War Eagle. Five people in it. They were all banged up some, but not hurt seriously."

G. W. Griffith, union field man in the Bluefield-Welch, W. Va., area, told us:

"Our people are 50 years behind modern-day living. Only about 5 percent of the houses are good. Very few have bathrooms."

FIGURES SEEM EXAGGERATED

His percentage of good houses seemed exaggerated from our observations, but the housing situation in general has furnished UMW Chief Lewis with a powerful argument in the contract controversy with the operators.

Mr. Kiser said the two best mine camps in the Williamson field, about half of which is across the Tug River in Kentucky, were those of the Red Jacket Coal Corp. and the Eastern Coal Corp. We inspected the latter, located in Kentucky about 8 miles from Williamson.

The company operates four mines and officials told us there were 800 company houses, most of them of four rooms. About 90 percent had running water and 25 percent bathrooms. The exteriors were freshly refinished with composition board. The interiors did

not live up to our expectations. Rent was \$2.50 a room per month and \$1.50 extra for a bath.

Rentals at Eastern were about the standard for all of the coal areas surveyed. The houses were above average.

COMPLAIN OF LOW RENTS

Some of the mine operators claimed that one reason they could not furnish better housing was because they were paying 1946 wages to the miners and giving them the houses at 1910 rental rates. Frank P. Kerr, Eastern general manager, was one of that group.

"What the hell kind of a house does Mr. Lewis think we can furnish for \$10 a month?" he asked.

We talked with some of Mr. Kerr's miners, among them Leon Hackney, 25, who was waiting for a bus. Mr. Hackney strayed from our subject of housing, talked about a lot of things and, when his bus arrived, waved us over to his house and wife. What he said may be of interest, anyway, as an insight into mine life.

He is a native of the area; eighth-grade education; went to work in the mines at 19 and gets \$63.50 a week as a brakeman on minecars when he works 54 hours. He arises at 6 a. m., is at work by 7; out of the mine by 4, 6 days a week, says "I'm tired of this 6-day business." Eating in the mine upsets his stomach, as it affects many, so he goes without lunch. He bathes after work and has dinner at 4:45. Afterward he walks "up and down the road," reads a paper or book and retires about 9. Twice a week he breaks his routine and accompanies his wife to the company movie.

PLEASED WITH CONDITIONS

Mr. Hackney doesn't drink. On Sunday he rests or goes to a movie, perhaps in Williamson. He leaves off the movies now because he is broke. All he knows about the miners' contract fight he reads in the paper; he has never seen Mr. Lewis. He would like most the 5-day week and pay boost; doesn't understand the welfare demand. Thinks the house is fine; likes to deal at company store and thinks medical and hospital arrangement good. He attends union meetings twice monthly. Sold his small car recently.

Mrs. Sylvania Hackney didn't see things as rosy as her husband. She has a daughter, 10, by a previous marriage, plus a 4-year-old boy and girl twins and another boy 3 years old. Also living with them are two of her brothers. One is a miner for another company. The other was just discharged from the Army. The first brother, Clayton Stiltner, 37, pays \$31 a month room and board; the other nothing so far.

Mrs. Hackney thinks the house a mess inside and she is right. The walls are smoke-blackened, and the whole layout not too clean. She says it has not been painted inside in 35 years. Nevertheless, there was a lot she could do to make it a better place. It is heated by coal grates in each room. There's water but no bath. She says she needs a new coal stove and washing machine. They pay \$12.50 a month rent.

The sleeping arrangement was very crowded. Three children occupy the living room; the parents and youngest child a first-floor bedroom. Her brothers sleep in one upstairs room. The other is useless when the weather is bad, because there are no window sashes. They have complained about that to the company.

They have no war bonds or other savings. "We could have saved something if we tried to, but we're just like everybody else," she said, adding that she had stored away more than \$100 in groceries in anticipation of the strike, most of which are gone.

"I think Lewis is doing all he can for the miners, but it seems like there are an awful lot of strikes. They put you behind. By the

time you get caught up from one, another comes along. Boy, I'm all for the union, though. What I would really like is a union with no strikes. But I guess it takes strikes to hold it together. I say for them to stay out 6 months if that's needed to get what they want. We will make out somehow. I don't know what we would do though if the company cut off our credit at the store" (the union guaranteed the store against loss up to \$1,000)."

The Hackneys have no radio. They subscribe to a Williamson paper, and Mr. Stiltner, the miner, takes a Philadelphia paper which arrives a few days late. Asked about the paper, he said: "Met a lady down the creek—she sold me a subscription."

TELLS OF WILD DRIVING

Eastern company mines are located on a small stream, Pond Creek, which courses through the Kentucky mountains some 15 miles, emptying into the Tug River at Williamson. There is a concentration of mines along the stream and miners' houses dot its sides the whole way.

A narrow road winds along the creek. Last summer a flash flood washed out the road along with some of the miners' families, and it is in need of repair. A Williamson cab driver, who said he did a lively business with Pond Creek miners at \$3 a head when they were working, told us something about the road.

"That's the most dangerous stretch of road in the United States on Saturday nights," he said. "Them miners get paid, take on a load of likker, and head for town down the hollow in their cars. Boy, I wouldn't haul nobody up there Saturday night for a thousand dollars. Tried it once and got side-swiped three times."

In wandering about hundreds of miles of coal country roads through scores of mine properties, perhaps the most rundown camp we saw was that of the Kentucky Straight Creek Coal Co., near Pineville, Ky., where a mine explosion last December cost the lives of 25 men. The houses were blackened, tumbled-down shacks that appeared never to have been painted or whitewashed. A miner said he paid \$2.25 a room for one of the hovels, and that in some cases as many as 10 persons were crammed into a four-room shack.

CLAIM RENTS PAY FOR HOUSES

Union officials declared that even the comparatively low rents charged for the houses had paid for the structures several times. They said the original costs varied from around \$1,000 up to \$4,000, depending on size and type of construction. Only a handful of houses built of material other than wood were seen.

Neat frame structures marked the Pocahontas Fuel Co. camp, Pocahontas, Va. The company was said to mine the richest coal seam in the whole region. A subsidiary of United States Steel, the U. S. Coal & Coke Co. supplied its miners about Gary, W. Va., with adequate homes. A score of new homes dotted a hillside of the Seco Coal Co. camp, near Jenkins, Ky.

The quality of houses frequently varied greatly within a single camp. So it was with the American Coal Co., near McComas, W. Va., in the Bluefield-Welch section. Some were fresh and new in appearance, others run down.

Often the interiors of those with a dingy exterior were better, cleaner, and neater than ones in the same camp which appeared good from the outside. At the American Co. camp Steve Barlow, a mustachioed veteran of about 60, occupied a run-down place with his wife. Mr. Barlow said he had lived there 37 years and it had been painted twice, once by the company and the other time by himself. The home was clean inside, although the chimney seemed about to fall through the roof.

FINDS MINERS COULD HELP

There was no doubt that in innumerable instances the miners could do much to make their houses better places. Too many appeared content to live in dirt and filth, supplying a home for rats as well as themselves.

The typical miner's house almost always seemed to have a creek nearby which was a catch-all for garbage and whatever waste the family had to discard.

We asked several United Mine Workers' officers why the union did not conduct a campaign to educate its members in better ways of living. Some admitted that much could be done in that field.

Mr. Kiser, the Williamson union representative, said that for many years a miner could not get a job unless he lived in a company house. He added that it was the company's responsibility to keep the houses in repair with the rents collected, but that in most cases if the miner wanted anything done he had to do it himself.

"There is little incentive for a man to do the work himself," he continued, "since he never knows how long he will live there and is ever hopeful of getting a better place to live."

[From the Washington Star of April 29, 1946]

DISABLED MINERS FIND INDUSTRY'S PROVISIONS FOR CARE INADEQUATE—ALLOWANCES FOR CRIPPLED AND DISEASED MEN OFTEN SHORT OF DECENT LIVING STANDARD

(By James Y. Newton)

The lines of the crippled and diseased, of men burned-out physically before their time, that file into the coal-field offices of the United Mine Workers, and the stories the men tell, seem to testify to the inadequacy of the coal industry's schemes for caring for its unfortunate employees.

By this we do not mean to imply endorsement either of John L. Lewis' demand for a union health-and-welfare fund, supported by a royalty or tax on coal, or of the operators' counterproposal for a joint fund to be used to "mitigate unusual hardships" arising from occupational accidents, and administered by some independent agency. That controversy does not concern us here.

Visits were made to union offices in Williamson and Welch, W. Va., centers of large coal production, and in both the story was pretty much the same. There appeared to be at least three general types of cases where the present assistance given the men is inadequate. These are:

1. Compensation awarded those both partially and totally disabled in mine accidents frequently is insufficient to match a man's loss of earning power and too small to enable him to live decently.

2. Coal mining is rough, hard work. The miner is knocked about, breathes impure air, and works under artificial light. Consequently, he is burned out at 50 and 60 years of age, and, more often than not, has no means of support until his Federal old-age pension comes in at 65.

3. There are numerous disease cases where help is needed. Some are border-line cases where the State compensation board ruled that the man's troubles did not result from an occupational injury. Many of these, it appeared, could be decided either way. In any event, the miner is incapacitated and finds the going tough.

Cecil Davis, 45, of Naugatuck, W. Va., has been a miner for 25 years. His wife is the only dependent. Last June 19, the wheels of a coal-cutting machine almost severed his hand. It has healed, but is twisted and distorted and he is unable to close it. Bones protrude under the skin nearly an inch above the normal level of the back of his hand. There's a large knot on his wrist. He said the arm is of little use to him.

DREW \$16 WEEKLY

Mr. Davis said he drew \$16 a week compensation until November 18, nothing since then. He was first awarded \$343 compensation. The union fought the case. They got it up to \$1,132 for 85 percent disability to five fingers, nothing for the hand. He drew about a third of the total in the early installments, has \$795 to come.

The coal company, he said, was reluctant to reemploy him because his handicap might lead to another accident. He said he was uncertain just how much work about the mines he could do. They cut off his credit at the company store, he related, and offered him \$1,000 for his home that cost \$1,600 to build a year ago.

"I'm having a tough time," said Mr. Davis. "I've drawn nothing since November. I don't think I got enough for my hand."

Evans Juke, of War, W. Va., who said he was 50 and looked much older, illustrates another type of case. About 4 years ago he had a forefinger chopped off and the others badly smashed in a mine accident. He received \$16 a week compensation for a year.

About the time of the accident, Mr. Juke said he began having trouble with the arm and shoulder. It grew steadily worse until at the present time, he says "my arm and shoulder are paralyzed and it pains me all the time."

The compensation board ruled the additional ailments were not results of the mine injury and refused to make awards for them. The union took the case all the way to the State Supreme Court and lost.

Mr. Juke carried a letter dated last February from Dr. D. H. Hatfield, of Huntington, former Governor and Senator from West Virginia, diagnosing his ailments as neuritis extending from the "tips of the fingers to the shoulder inclusive," plus arthritis.

NOW TOTALLY DISABLED

"This man is 100 percent permanently and totally disabled for doing any kind of work," wrote Dr. Hatfield. "Not only is this true but he suffers excruciating pain all the time and is entitled to the care and consideration of the compensation department."

William M. Lester, assistant-UMW field director at Welch, said there was virtually no chance of getting further compensation. The miner said he lived on "crumbs and whatever I can find" and slept wherever he could get a spot.

A slate fall in August 1943 left William Sexton, 34, paralyzed from his waist down, so we went by his home to interview him. He was operating a coal-cutting machine in a mine 20 miles from Welch when the accident occurred. His back was broken in several places and four ribs were smashed from the backbone.

Mr. Sexton said he spent more than a year in and about hospitals at Huntington. They saved his life, but told him he would never walk again. His father lives in Huntington. He also injured his back in the mines and is unable to work.

The younger Sexton is married and has four children, three boys and a girl. He is bedridden and covered with sores. His wife nurses him and cares for the house and children. He lives in a tumble-down house 7 miles from Welch, one of a group of 31 at an abandoned mine. A real-estate firm bought the houses from the mining company, he said, and sold them to miners. He purchased his not long ago for \$1,375 because he had to have a place to live.

DEBTS GROW LARGER

Mr. Sexton receives the maximum in compensation, \$69.52 a month for life. He pays \$25 a month interest and principal on the house, and his bill for sterilized bandages and medicines averages \$16 a month. The electricity bill runs \$4 to \$5 a month. The heating and cooking stoves burn 20 tons of coal a year at \$6.58 a ton. Employed miners

in company houses get their coal for about \$2.80.

"I owe everybody," said Mr. Sexton worriedly. "I can't pay my bills. They just get bigger and bigger."

He apparently was pretty well fixed at the time his back was smashed. The Sextons had an electric refrigerator, washing machine, an expensive cabinet radio, and similar gadgets. He said a store took the refrigerator for a bill he owed. The radio went to pay moving charges.

There was no bathroom or water in the house. Mr. Sexton said he could get water if he had the money to run a pipe up the hill.

"I don't feel much good today," he said. "Haven't slept last two nights. Got pain most all the time. I can do anything mighty near with my hands when I'm able to."

He then had his wife exhibit a guitar he fashioned from an old piece of furniture, a chair covering embroidered with "Home Sweet Home" and numerous dogs and cats made of fur. A wall plaque in the living room read, "Must Jesus bear the cross alone and all the world go free," and another in his room, "Give me my flowers while I live."

W. H. Nelson, Beckley, W. Va., union compensation attorney, said he handled hundreds of cases where he termed the payments for mining injuries inadequate.

He showed the record of George Wade, 60, of Worth. In a written diagnosis a doctor said he had second-stage silicosis. In filing out the compensation from April 15, the doctor had scratched out "second stage" and written "first stage" above it. Compensation amounts to \$800 for first stage, \$1,600 for second, lifetime payments for third stage. The union contends the man is totally disabled. Mr. Nelson said he had a chance of getting the \$1,600.

"After he spends that, he's through," Mr. Nelson said.

He cited the case of a 30-year-old colored man blinded from miners' nystagmus, who got nothing in the way of compensation because the State law does not cover that particular disease. It is a result of constant irritation of the eyes and working in poor light.

The mine workers admit that too few of them save any of their earnings to tide them over the rainy days that always come, often pretty early, in the coal industry. Miners are notoriously free spenders. Most of the rank and file admit making good money the past several years, although not many have tucked it away. They usually have big families, and reputedly are suckers for every salesman who comes along. A young man like Mr. Sexton, however, hardly could have saved enough to have helped him very much.

On the other side of the picture, Lawrence Runyon, superintendent of the Premier Pocahontas Collieries Co., Welch, took us by to see one of his company's pensioners. He was Monk Swan, 80-year-old colored man, who came to work for the firm in 1901. He had been a coal loader. He lived in a neat house which the company furnished free along with coal, lights, and \$40 a month spending money. He was making out all right.

"Here's this man I was telling you about who came by to take you to Washington tomorrow," Mr. Runyon told the old man.

"No, sir, boss," he replied. "Postpone it or veto it. Veto it until the next day."

PENSION CASES CITED

Mr. Runyon said his company had others on pension, but that most of the companies did not have them. For one thing, a majority of the miners do not seem to work for one firm long enough to be eligible for a pension. Then, hundreds of companies are operating now because of the abnormally great demand for coal. They operate costly thin seams of coal on a shoestring and most

likely will not be in the business after the industry's backlog of orders is met.

Many miners claimed "we do not get our money's worth" in medical care and hospitalization, but they were not very clear when asked for amplification. Most of the big companies employ doctors, just as they own the stores, movie houses, recreation halls, and other facilities about the mining camps. The miner pays so much a month and in every case we encountered it was voluntary.

There were shortages of doctors and hospital space, but that is true of Washington and other parts of the country. A coal operator in Kentucky with four mines employed two doctors to care for 1,200 miners and their large families. He admitted the need for two more and said he was trying to get them. Welch, a town of 7,000, has four hospitals, three reportedly good ones. But space is at a premium because Welch is the center of more than 100 mines.

INSURANCE AVAILABLE

The charge generally made for care from the company doctor appeared to be \$1.50 a month for a single man and \$2 for married, with treatment for venereal diseases and maternity cases extra. Hospitalization costs the miner \$2.25 a month, burial fund, usually handled by the union, \$1. Larger companies made group health and accident insurance available to their workers. The Premier Co., cited above, charged \$3.40 a month for insurance that paid \$10.50 a week to the average inside mine worker, plus a \$500 death benefit. They said 88 percent of the men carried it, a percentage that seemed high for the coal fields generally.

West Virginia, the mine workers say, has a more liberal compensation law and more stringent safety regulations than Kentucky or the coal-mining States of the South.

Workmen's compensation only recently was made compulsory by the Kentucky Legislature following the explosion at Pineville, in which 25 miners lost their lives. The men left more than 100 widows and children. The mine operator, the Kentucky Straight Creek Coal Co., carried no compensation. The dependents were left without support.

In the course of the survey we visited the Pocahontas Fuel Co. funeral home at Pocahontas, Va., which was accused by the United Mine Workers of "body-snatching," taking over the bodies of miners without authorization of the families.

W. W. Edwards, home manager, said his men acted only on direction of the coroner or the family of the deceased. He showed his books and offered to show his equipment, which he claimed was the most modern in the entire area. In the past year, the company establishment handled 150 funerals, including those of 5 miners killed at work.

DIDN'T GIVE CONSENT

We did interview a miner, however, who said the body of one of his children who died in 1941 was taken to the funeral parlor without his consent. He said the company doctor ordered the body removed from his home.

Another of the miners' charges in opening negotiations was that some West Virginia company doctors charged \$5 more for delivering girl babies than for boys. We found no evidence of it. The best explanation seemed to be that company doctors charge nonemployees \$5 additional for all deliveries.

Miners interviewed during the survey were forever grouching about the number of deductions from their bimonthly pay envelope. At McComas, W. Va., Frank Lunsford, 42, scurried up to his house and brought back two of his envelopes. He worked for the Pocahontas Fuel Co., and said he had been a miner 26 years. He is married and has three children. Two others had died.

An envelope dated March 24 showed he had worked 108 hours and was credited with \$127

pay for the 2 weeks included. It recorded the following formal deductions:

Credit checks, said to be scrip expendable only at company stores and other establishments, \$14; store account, \$25.15; rent, \$6.50; lights, \$2.22; coal, \$1.40; hauling the coal, \$1; hospitalization, \$1.10; doctor, \$1; Red Cross, \$1; bonds, \$3.25; burial fund, 80 cents; union dues, 80 cents; social security, \$1.27; and withholding tax, \$3.30.

This left him \$33.21. But over at one side that figure was noted and \$21.89 subtracted from it. That left him a cash balance of \$11.32. The final big deduction was not explained, so we asked Mr. Lunsford what it was. He said the company told him it was "overdraft" and he professed to know nothing more about it. The best explanation we got was that it represented bills the man ran up with the company after the envelope was made up.

"This envelope here," said Mr. Lunsford, "doesn't include my insurance (health and accident). They took out \$3 for that the first pay period of the month."

Most of Mr. Lunsford's deductions, it will be noted, represented halves of monthly charges for the various items and services. Most of the miners have the same deductions, except that his company deductions were much larger than the average.

[From the Washington Post of May 8, 1946]
"LIKE TWO JIMA"—REPORTER FINDS APPALACHIAN MINING CONDITIONS APPALLING

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

HARLAN, KY., May 7.—I have just been through the bituminous coal areas of the Appalachian Mountains, where the fatalities read like battle reports from Two Jima.

Since the Christmas disaster at Fourmile, where 20 miners were buried alive, 27 miners have been killed by other accidents in this area. From 146 to 180 miners are killed in Kentucky every year. In 1944, 10,000 out of 67,000 coal miners were injured in major industrial accidents in Kentucky; only 6,338 received compensation, usually inadequate. According to the Federal Bureau of Mines, in the last 35 years, 66,140 men were killed in the anthracite and bituminous fields, an average of 1,889 men per year. Why does the Nation countenance such wholesale slaughter in one of its most essential industries?

These miners need a welfare fund, though it is a question who should control it. They need much more than that. They need a chance to live like human beings. They need a chance to escape from the pigsties they are forced to inhabit. They need health instead of filthy water supplies, insanitary toilets, bad odors, flies, mosquitoes, and the diseases that result from them. They must be assured a living wage. They are entitled to safe working conditions instead of being forced to walk daily into a death trap. Above all things, they need to be freed from some of the most vicious operators and politicians that have ever turned American citizens into slaves.

Before I describe the horrors, the injustices, and the terrorism I have witnessed in the Tennessee-East Kentucky area, it is only fair to say that I know the conditions in the Pennsylvania bituminous regions. Conditions there are a veritable heaven in comparison with the hell in which I spent last week.

This Appalachian area is notoriously the worst mining district in the country. In the whole region there is but one first-rate operation. It is Lynch, Ky., run by the United States Steel Co. There are five, possibly six, others that are fairly good. The rest in varying degrees are a disgrace to the industry and to the Nation. Daily they threaten the well-being of some 70,000 men and their families in Kentucky and Tennessee, or, given the high birth rate, nearly 400,000 people.

I began my tour of the bituminous coal region at Fourmile, near Middlesboro, Ky., where the explosion occurred last Christmas that shook the whole country. Twenty heads of families are still entombed. The mine has been sealed to extinguish the flames and cannot be reopened as yet. Five men escaped, one of whom died subsequently.

I interviewed three of them, one in the hospital. None of these men will ever work again as miners. Their hearts are bad; their bodies poisoned by coal gases. Neither they nor the families of the dead have ever received a cent of compensation from the mine owner. They had all signed the usual compensation contract, which had been presented by the mine company as though it was providing compensation. It was a fake. Actually no compensation was in force at the time of the accident.

SUPPORTED BY CHARITY

The mine workers are now pressing State officials to start criminal action against the mine owner. The 25 families are being supported by charity. A fund of \$120,000 raised by popular subscription and distributed at the average rate of \$120 a month per family will last them a little more than 3 years. After that the widows, wives, and numerous children will have to depend on the charity of the United Mine Workers.

The UMW tried to pass the same safety laws in Kentucky that exist in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois, but the operators defeated the bill. The coal-company lawyers have drafted all the Kentucky mining laws until the last legislature passed a slight modification of the compensation act. Heretofore all compensation for death or injury has been left to the good or bad will of the operators.

Why did the accident at Fourmile occur? Because the operator, to save a few dollars, shut off the fan that forces oxygen into the mine on the Saturday before Christmas. On Christmas night, 4 days later, the fan was turned on again. When the men went in the following morning, the accumulated coal gas ignited. Had it not been the Christmas season, about 100 more men would have been trapped. Mine operators such as this one—and they are plentiful in this area—daily risk the lives of their workers to get all the money they can in a short period. They are taking it out of the lives of the men instead of thinking about good ventilation and general efficiency.

UNFIT FOR HUMANS

At Fourmile I began my study of the miners' living conditions. The company houses are hovels so abominable that no human being should live in them. The roofs leak, the wind blows through crevices in walls and floors, the destruction and filth of generations are everywhere evident. Two families had lived for 30 years right at the mouth of the mine. These shacks with a local lumber supply had cost less than \$50 to \$75 to build originally. Yet these families for 30 years had paid first \$6, then \$9, a month, or some \$3,000 in all, for this abomination of a house and for the privilege of working from father to son in daily risk of their lives when they entered this mine.

There is no running water in such camps. One family uses a dirty trickle of a stream that comes from the hill where pigs run and cattle graze. Others use moldy, polluted old wells. Many walk blocks to the nearest source of water, which may be a clean spring in the higher locations or a dirty one if it is in the valley. The open outdoor toilets are often near the water supply. Refuse lies in the streams and in the all-pervasive mud.

The small children in these families are undernourished and scabby faced, either with skin diseases or filth. The miserable commissary in this mine has an inadequate variety of foods. Other stores are miles away. From 5 to a top of 32 children are crowded into these houses.

NO SIGN OF DISCIPLINE

The four-room school is battered and pitiful, but far better than it used to be. Two young teachers do their best to instruct about 150 children, of whom some 30 were in school. The others were playing hockey, as they usually do. Most of them drop out at the fifth or sixth grade. No vestige of discipline is discernible in the children nor the adults. Women in filthy clothes were rocking on the porch while the ragged, half-naked little ones played in the mud puddles that filled every depression after a rain.

These families were poor, illiterate mountain folk when they left the isolated hills for the insulated mining camps. There they have lived as virtual slaves before the union fought its bloody battles with the operators' sheriffs, gunmen, and gangsters, to ultimate victory and an organization which has been strong only the last 2 or 3 years. These mining families have never known what it means to have possessions, freedom, decency, and dignity even in better camps than Fourmile. The young men who grew up in the years of depression, want, and idleness, and then went to war, have never had a life.

Unlike the miners and mining families whom I interviewed in Pennsylvania, these folk have lived so long in isolation, fear, and suspicion that they are defensive, if not hostile, with a stranger. If my sympathy pierced their unresponsiveness, the more intelligent ones would show me their houses with a fierce indignation. But the groups of men idling about here and there, playing cards on the commissary steps, would never so much as look up at me when I began talking to them. They would answer my questions warily and distrustfully, out of one corner of the mouth, while they continued their games of penny ante.

THEY HAVE NEVER LEARNED

What a newcomer feels at once is that these people have never learned to be responsible for their own lives. Most of them never handled money before the union invasion, because they were permanently in debt to the company store. Now that they get more money, they spend it often before pay day. The management of money, of a budget, a desire for cleanliness, health, order, and self-development cannot be learned overnight.

[From the Washington Post of May 9, 1946]
STRIKERS UNAWARE OF PUBLIC OPINION—REPORTER PRESENTS MINERS' VIEWPOINT ON WAGES, WELFARE

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

HARLAN, KY., May 8.—The country at large must try to understand the slowly mounting tension of the striking miners in the Appalachian area and the reasons behind this smoldering impatience. At first they enjoyed a chance to rest. These men had been working 9 hours a day, 6 days a week to meet the increased demands of war production. Through sheer patriotism the Big Sandy area, with less men, doubled the output of the mines.

The miners were tired and took to fishing and hunting at the beginning of the strike. But their mood is changing. They cannot understand why their demands for a living wage and a minimum of safety provisions should not receive immediate recognition. Public opinion and popular indignation over the gradual stoppage of the wheels of production throughout the Nation scarcely reaches them in their incredible isolation. They want to go back to work. But said they: "We have already used up the funds of the local union and we will use up every cent of our accumulated war bonds, before we will accept defeat of what seems to us the most elementary justice."

At a camp near Harlan I asked the miners and a group of local labor leaders what they

expected to get out of the strike. "We want a living wage," they said, "enforcement of adequate safety provisions, and a welfare fund to take care of the families of the boys who get killed or disabled. During the war," they explained to me, "we got \$10 per day for 9 hours' work, 6 days a week, portal to portal—or \$63.50 for 54 hours. Now that the war is over we are afraid the 7-hour day and the 5-day week will be restored, which means a basic salary of \$35 a week under the 1941 contract, or a substandard wage for the hardest, dirtiest work in all industry. In most of the mines about 40 percent of the men are on this daily rate of \$1 per hour, and 60 percent are on the tonnage rate of 65 cents per ton. These skilled men used to get higher wages than the men on the day rate and some still do if they work in a high-grade mine. If the tonnage men have a poor streak of coal, they often get less than the men on daily rates."

They then showed me the company's pay sheet at the Black Mountain Coal Co. for the last 2 weeks before the strike. For 10 working days the tonnage men of equal skills ranged from \$41.91 to \$123 because of the different physical conditions they happened to encounter. "On the average throughout the year," they continued, "the tonnage men make about what the men on daily rates are getting but the tonnage men hate the big variations in their pay. If they go back to the 7-hour day and 5-day week, they will also make only about \$35 a week, plus travel time."

"We were having a hard time feeding our children on \$35 a week before the war. With the high cost of living, the men and their big families can't possibly exist on that kind of a wage scale. As our industry is the lowest paid and one that is indispensable to the country's welfare, we think we are entitled at the very least to a 20-percent increase for the day rate and the tonnage men. That will give us take-home pay equivalent to the increased cost of living as recognized by governmental agencies. It would only give us the same purchasing power we had in 1941."

"Every bit as important to us," continued the men, "is the enforcement of safety laws with teeth in them. The Department of Mines and Minerals in Kentucky is run by the operators to suit themselves. There is no union deputy among the nine mine inspectors. Our union inspectors pass the examination but they never get appointed to the board. Our mining laws are bad with plenty of loopholes. The law says that the mines should be inspected four times a year. This is not being lived up to. Our union investigator reported to the Committee on Mines and Mining, which was considering recodifying the safety laws, that the mines have been inspected once every 8 years instead of four times a year."

"The Federal reports of the Bureau of Mines showed that 99 percent of the mines of the east Kentucky area are not rock-dusted, which is an elementary protection against coal dust. Eighty-two percent of them are dangerous because they have bad air. Permissible or sealed machinery which is the only safe kind, does not exist in our mines. The operators defeated a bill which made this safe kind of machinery compulsory. In addition the electric wires are not protected. It wears a man out just to dodge the live wires all day."

"We asked for 30 inches of clearance between the mine walls and the cars. It was refused by the operators, although extra room in the mine actually adds to its efficiency. The men are always in danger and always have to be on the alert. Yet the mines down here could provide the best working conditions because the coal in our area is the finest in the whole country. It is premium coal which commands the highest price. We are sure that the public, if it knew what was going on, would rather have a slight increase in the

price of coal than the wholesale murder of miners that now goes on in this State."

CALLS OPERATORS GREEDY

"What the country doesn't realize," said one miner with livid indignation, "is that the greed of the coal operators exploits not only the workers but the natural coal resources of Kentucky. Anybody can start a mine here on a shoestring. The operations are inefficient and wasteful, skimming the cream from the coal mines for a quick monetary return, then abandoning them for other veins. These operators are using up the Nation's substance. As the Kentucky Legislature has always been dominated by the operators, there has never been a tax on coal and all our State gets for its natural wealth is a lot of holes in the ground."

"Yet people are blaming John Lewis for asking for a 10-cent tax on every ton of coal for the welfare fund. If it had not been for the war, we workers would have insisted upon this welfare fund long ago. Without it we live at the mercy of a bunch of operators who are the worst in the whole country. A fairly decent compulsory compensation law was actually passed by the legislature several years ago but the State Supreme Court at the behest of the operators declared it unconstitutional. The last legislature has passed another compensation law. It isn't enough but it is better than nothing. This will become the law on June 1 next unless the Supreme Court of Kentucky throws it out again."

"We think that the miner and his family should be covered by a national insurance policy. We should have a medical and hospital system that will be recognized as sufficient by outstanding medical authorities. At present we pay \$2 for hospitalization and \$2 for medical care for a man and his family. But what do we get for it?"

I had discovered at Middlesboro what a racket the operators have made of the medical fund. There are two hospitals in this city of 40,000 people, one of them so atrocious that the miners avoid it. It has over a hundred beds and not a single registered nurse. The other one of 50 beds has just been taken over and renovated by six doctors. It has good facilities and an adequate nursing staff, five of whom are graduate nurses. But these two hospitals also take care of the general public. At the good hospital I was told the care of the miners was so expensive that the doctors would demand a raise in the insurance rate. Yet the 20,000 mining families in this one area pay \$80,000 a month in health insurance."

The company doctors are also unpopular with the workers. At one mine the doctor was a dope addict. Yet the company would not dismiss him until the miners broke their contract, went on strike, and defied the international rather than go back to work before this doctor was removed."

BAD SITUATION

"The worst part about the check-off system for medical care is that the doctors in all of these hospitals are practically in the pay of the operators," said the miners. "These medical men determine how much compensation a man should get when he is injured and whether he is fit to go back to work or not. That is a bad situation. There are many cases when these doctors minimize the compensation; or they say a man is fit to go back to work although he cannot stand the strain of his old job. When he fails to make good, he is simply thrown out as useless."

"With a welfare fund and the \$4 that we pay monthly for medical care, our unions could operate first-class hospitals and engage their own doctors."

"We also want to use this welfare fund for a rehabilitation program for the thousands of injured miners. With retraining most of these men could be restored to useful occupa-

tions. The permanently disabled who now receive a compensation of \$15 a week, would get supplementary aid through a welfare fund."

Another way by which the miners could be assured of a welfare program would be through a State tax of 10 cents on every ton of coal mined in Kentucky. Yet the politicians of these mining areas have been so completely under the domination of the operators that the miners, with good reason, do not trust them. They are convinced that a State welfare tax on coal would never reach their families."

The miners are thinking only in terms of their acute needs. Yet nobody who realizes the power this welfare fund would give the United Mine Workers Union over its membership can be reconciled to its complete control of these funds. Perhaps the solution is a Federal bureau similar to the Railroad Retirement Fund with advisory representation from the unions and management."

The welfare program which the miners outlined is the barest minimum of what they need. Where does one start welfare work for people who have nothing—no decent homes, no sanitary facilities, no chance for cleanliness and no possibility of escape from the most appalling of the many appalling social situations I have seen in this democracy of ours?

Just the amount of maternal and child care needed in these mining towns staggers the imagination. I could get no figures on maternal deaths but the infant mortality rate is 100 or more out of every 1,000 live births. And what have the children that live and grow up in these surroundings to look forward to? A life so barren, so devoid of opportunity for health, for education, for recreation, for ordinary human happiness—yes, so devoid of hope that it is heart-breaking."

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to discuss for a few minutes House bill 4908, which is the pending measure before this body. I am very glad that we have finally gotten around to giving consideration to legislation of this nature. I think it is high time that something be done along this line.

Mr. President, no one is today or ever has been a more sincere friend of labor than I am. I believe in the right of labor to organize, the right to bargain collectively; likewise I believe in the right of labor to strike. But I do not believe that any group of our citizens, whether they be laboring men or businessmen, should be immune from observing the law as it applies to all other people.

When I was Governor of the State of Texas, the great wave of strikes was sweeping over the country. The sit-down strikes, first promoted by the Communists in Paris and later adopted by the CIO in America, were in full bloom. I felt that, as Governor of Texas, I had an obligation to the great rank and file of the people and that I had an obligation to the laboring men within that State to do what I could to protect the individual workman and to protect society generally against labor racketeers and against the goon squads that were becoming so active.

Therefore, in a message to the Legislature of the State of Texas, I recommended that a law be enacted which would outlaw force and violence as a means of winning labor disputes. The legislature followed my advice; it enacted a law which makes it a felony in

Texas for any man or for any group of men to seek by the use of force and violence to prevent any other person from following a lawful vocation. This law has proved its value within the State of Texas; violence in labor disputes has practically been eliminated within that State. I am thankful that since Texas pioneered the way in the passage of this legislation, some other States have passed similar legislation.

Since I was elected to the United States Senate I have tried to point out the need for the enactment by the Congress of sound and constructive labor legislation.

I introduced a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment which would outlaw the closed shop. I do not believe that any sound argument can be made for allowing a labor union and an employer, acting jointly, to negotiate a contract which would force workmen to affiliate with the union even though they may not desire to do so.

As I observed the working of the National Labor Relations Board and as I studied the report on the activities of that board as issued by the Smith committee, I was impressed with the fact that it was absolutely essential to the welfare of the American people that the Wagner labor law be amended. Legislation which I have proposed in the Senate, if enacted into law, would not only make it illegal for employers to use force and coercion to prevent employees from affiliating with labor organizations, but it would likewise make it illegal for labor unions to use force and coercion to require membership in their organization.

I proposed another amendment to the Wagner labor law which would permit the employer, so long as he did not use threats, to discuss frankly with his employees any labor situation which might arise, and express to his employees his opinion on such matters.

I introduced a bill which would outlaw the use of force and violence in all labor disputes.

Consistently, ever since I have been a Member of the United States Senate I have urged the importance of legislation along these general lines. Some time ago when a labor bill was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], which sought to improve the general labor situation in America, I announced on the floor of the Senate that while there were some provisions of the bill I did not absolutely like, I would be delighted to support the bill if it came up for consideration. But at the same time I expressed the opinion that it was not likely that the bill would ever come out of the Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate.

Some days ago we received from the House of Representatives what is generally referred to as the Case bill, and, under the pressure of existing labor conditions throughout the United States, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor finally reported the bill which we now have under consideration. And I state frankly that I think the country would be far better off not to have any labor legislation than it would if the Congress

were to pass this bill which was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Education and Labor.

This bill, in the form reported by a majority of the committee, sets up a system designed to strengthen the mediation machinery of the Federal Government, and probably this feature of the bill has some merit, but in the form it was presented I doubt that it has very much merit. But the crowning irony of all legislation I have ever seen proposed to the United States Senate appears in the provision in this bill that if labor union goon squads, racketeers, and hijackers go out on the highway and interfere with the movement of perishable farm products they may be prosecuted.

Under the Senate committee's version of the bill, if a farmer was hauling a load of watermelons to town and labor racketeers interfered with his delivery of the watermelons they could be prosecuted; but, on the other hand, if he had a load of cotton on the truck and was trying to get it to town they could not be prosecuted because cotton is not a perishable product. In other words, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor not only went on record as wanting to confine the illegal acts of the goon squads and the racketeers strictly to the movement of farm products, but they went further and provided that those men could be called to the bar of justice only in cases where the products being moved were perishable farm products.

If the Senate of the United States were to pass the proposed legislation in its present form it would thereby be going on record as believing these labor racketeers and these goon squads had the right to congregate on the highway and stop the movement of any and all goods except in one limited case, and that would be in the movement of perishable farm products. I say in all sincerity that I think it would be a disgrace for the Senate to pass such legislation, and I ask this question: Since when did it become good legislation to restrain the use of force and violence on the part of one group of citizens under one set of conditions and permit it under all other conditions?

I have read very carefully the minority views on H. R. 4908, the Federal Mediation Act of 1946, as filed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. In my judgment, the minority views embody some sound, constructive thinking. Senators who have taken time to read them will understand that they do not in any sense, nor can they by any stretch of the imagination be construed as limiting any legitimate right of any individual workman, or of any labor union.

The six amendments proposed by the minority of the committee, if enacted into law, would most definitely improve the law as it applies to labor problems in the United States. They set up what I regard as a reasonable provision covering mediation and arbitration, with reasonable limitations on the right of workmen to strike in certain industries of National importance.

The amendments seek to say to organized labor that the United States

Government has, by law, required employers to bargain with their employees, and, if possible, to agree on written contracts and, therefore, the Government now says that in those cases where, through collective bargaining, agreements are made, it shall become the responsibility of labor to see that the contracts are carried out, and labor is made responsible for obeying the contracts which it has voluntarily entered into.

These amendments recognize that the secondary boycott is being used throughout this Nation today as a means of coercion and force. It is a well known fact that the secondary boycott is being used between rival labor organizations where the product of an employer is boycotted because it is made by some other organized group. Likewise it is being used to boycott the product of an employer if his employees have not seen fit to affiliate with any organized group. Certainly, it is the business and the responsibility of the United States Senate to enact legislation which will protect employers in their right to make labor contracts with any labor union they may see fit, with the assurance that they and their product will not be barred from the market because some other union is not satisfied.

Certainly, employers are entitled under the law to such protection. Certainly, if the employees of a given manufacturer have elected to work without being members of any labor organization, they have a right to do so and no other group has a right to apply the force of boycott to take away from such employees the right to decide what they will and what they will not do.

The proposed amendments to this bill seek to protect employees in their right to decide what they want to do within the field of labor relations. They seek to protect the employer in his rights and, in fact, they seek to protect all citizens against the boycott being used as a means of building up the power of labor bosses and labor racketeers. If the amendments to this bill are enacted into law, unions hereafter will not only be permitted to make labor contracts, but they will be required under the law to carry them out in good faith.

I would not say that the six amendments which are proposed to this bill will cover all the evils in existing law, but I think that they are constructive, and represent the irreducible minimum of legislation which the Senate can afford to pass at this time. So far as I am concerned, if we must choose between the bill as it was reported by the majority of the Committee on Education and Labor and no legislation, then I shall vote for no legislation.

It seems to me that the United States Senate, if it refuses to accept these amendments, will place itself in a very awkward position. How could we, as Senators, justify voting for a law which would make it illegal for hijackers to go on the highway and stop a truck hauling perishable farm commodities, but would not make it illegal for them to do the same thing if the truck happened to be loaded with manufactured goods?

When laws passed by the Congress of the United States require that employers,

whether they want to or not, must bargain collectively with unions, and enter into contracts if they can reach agreement, how can we justify refusing to vote for a law which will make such contracts enforceable?

When the antitrust laws of this Nation and the antiracketeering laws make it illegal for our citizens to enter into combinations in restraint of trade, and into conspiracies against the public interest, how can we justify refusing to make such laws applicable to labor unions when they are guilty of similar acts?

Under the law, the use of the secondary boycott is absolutely prohibited to all our citizens engaged in any line of business. Why should we refuse to make the law applicable also to members of labor unions?

Under the provisions of the Wagner labor law, if the supervisor or the foreman in an establishment makes any comment critical of a labor union, the employer is held responsible for such act on the theory that the foreman or supervisor is a part of management, and, therefore, the employer is responsible. Under the existing ruling of the National Labor Relations Board, it is held that the employer must, if called upon to do so, enter into collective bargaining with those foremen and supervisors. In other words, we ask the employer to recognize a part of management as being a part of labor unions, and then we hold that the employer is responsible for the acts of these persons who are a part of management.

Certainly such conclusions are unsound and represent a situation which places the employer in such a position that it is impossible for him to know what he may do and what he may not do. I fail to see any good reason why we should refuse here in the Senate to make clear by law that supervisory employees and foremen, upon whom management must rely in carrying out the work of management, shall not be subject to the provisions of the Wagner labor law.

I certainly hope that every one of the amendments suggested in the minority views on H. R. 4908 will be enacted into law. That will be at least a step in the direction of correcting existing difficulties.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have great respect for the knowledge of the able Senator from Texas of, let us say, agricultural conditions in his great agricultural State of Texas. Suppose the agricultural workers of his State were to decline to work because they did not feel they had a satisfactory wage contract with their employer. What law does the able Senator suggest would be brought to apply to them in order to cause the work stoppage to be discontinued?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think the answer to the question propounded by the able Senator from Florida is very elemental. It is well known that there should be no law to compel persons to work against their will in the United States, as our Government is organized.

Mr. PEPPER. All the amendments may, in the opinion of some Senators, tend to have some advantage of an indirect sort, but does the able Senator think that any of the amendments now pending would put the miners back into the pits and start the production of coal again?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I do not know whether the Senator from Florida followed my speech or not, but I made no reference to the amendments which are proposed to be offered to the bill. I spoke only on the bill as it came from the committee, and with reference to the majority report on the bill, and the views of the minority.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator does feel, does he not, that it would be in the public interest if we did have a conciliation and mediation and arbitration service, as the committee itself recommended? He might wish to go further, but he does think it would be in the public interest if we had it, does he not?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think that if the employees and the employers desire arbitration, that is a matter for them to decide. I think the Government is wholly without bounds in putting its finger in the pie.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator means in insisting upon compulsory arbitration?

Mr. O'DANIEL. On enforcing compulsory arbitration.

Mr. PEPPER. I thoroughly agree with the able Senator, and of course the Senator is aware that is not recommended by the committee in the committee bill.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes, I am fully aware of that.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

THE RETAIL LUMBER BUSINESS AND THE OPA

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to two recent activities of the OPA which have caused much concern and considerable difficulty. I received a letter this morning from a lumber company in Des Moines, in my State, which reads as follows:

I know that you receive loads of letters from Iowa lumbermen protesting the various orders issued by OPA, which are damaging to the retail lumbermen, and while I do not wish to further burden you with correspondence concerning matters with which you are thoroughly acquainted, I do want to call your attention to a recent order put out by OPA which I believe to be the most damaging one which has ever come out of that organization.

That is the order whereby the manufacturers of lumber on the West Coast and elsewhere can open up retail yards and sell their entire output at retail prices instead of wholesale prices. In case you haven't seen this order it is Amendment No. 20 to Second Revised MPR 215.

Under this order the manufacturer can sell his lumber at an average of \$15 per thousand more than he can get by selling it to retail lumber yards. Under this set-up he can get from 30 to 40 percent more for his output than he would realize by following the long-established methods of selling it through retail lumber yards.

With the tremendous demand which exists on the west coast it is obvious that the yards

in this section are going to get very little, if any, lumber.

To show you the attitude of the manufacturers I quote you as follows from two prominent west coast manufacturers, in letters which I received from them during the past week.

Mr. President, I shall set forth his quotation from one of them:

"Frankly, my partners are now in Los Angeles trying to get a location for a retail yard, and if successful, we would not be interested in any proposition in the Middle West."

I shall now quote from the second letter:

"The mills are all opening retail yards at their own plants or close thereto and their lumber will largely, if not entirely, be sold locally or to trucks which come there from long distances and get it, and the Middle West and East—

Bear in mind, Mr. President, this is the statement of a mill operator and owner talking about the lumber situation in the Middle West and East. This producer says:

"And the Middle West and East will get less lumber than they have been getting, and therefore I would say that the retail dealers east of here have something to worry about."

I continue with the letter:

This order was issued, according to my thinking, because it was impossible for the OPA to enforce the previous order whereby mills and wholesalers couldn't enter the retail business.

The damage which this order will do to the millions of dollars invested in the retail lumber business in Iowa and other Midwestern States cannot be estimated, but I believe that you can understand that it will be tremendous.

If along the line you can do anything to correct this very bad situation, I am sure that you will have the everlasting gratitude of the hundreds of Middle West lumbermen.

With very kind regards, I am,
Yours very truly.

Mr. President, I have a news release of April 22 containing amendment No. 20 to the second revised MPR 215. I ask unanimous consent that the letter I have just read, in its entirety, together with the news release of the OPA, and with amendment No. 20 of MPR 215, and the statement accompanying amendment No. 20 of MPR 215, be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROBT. CONNOR LUMBER Co.,
Des Moines, Iowa, May 14, 1946.
United States Senator
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOURKE: I know that you receive loads of letters from Iowa lumbermen protesting the various orders issued by OPA, which are damaging to the retail lumbermen, and while I do not wish to further burden you with correspondence concerning matters with which you are thoroughly acquainted, I do want to call your attention to a recent order put out by OPA which I believe to be the most damaging one which has ever come out of that organization.

That is the order whereby the manufacturers of lumber on the west coast and elsewhere can open up retail yards and sell their

entire output at retail prices instead of wholesale prices. In case you have not seen this order, it is amendment No. 20 to Second Revised MPR 215.

Under this order the manufacturer can sell his lumber at an average of \$15 per thousand more than he can get by selling it to retail lumberyards. Under this set-up he can get from 30 to 40 percent more for his output than he would realize by following the long-established methods of selling it through retail lumberyards.

With the tremendous demand which exists on the west coast it is obvious that the yards in this section are going to get very little, if any, lumber.

To show you the attitude of the manufacturers, I quote you as follows from two prominent west coast manufacturers, in letters which I received from them during the past week:

"Frankly, my partners are now in Los Angeles trying to get a location for a retail yard, and, if successful, we would not be interested in any proposition in the Middle West.

"The mills are all opening retail yards at their own plants or close thereto and their lumber will largely, if not entirely, be sold locally or to trucks which come there from long distances and get it, and the Middle West and East will get less lumber than they have been getting, and therefore I would say that the retail dealers east of here have something to worry about."

This order was issued, according to my thinking, because it was impossible for the OPA to enforce the previous order whereby mills and wholesalers couldn't enter the retail business.

The damage which this order will do to the millions of dollars invested in the retail lumber business in Iowa and other Midwestern States cannot be estimated, but I believe that you can understand that it will be tremendous.

If along the line you can do anything to correct this very bad situation, I am sure that you will have the everlasting gratitude of the hundreds of Middle West lumbermen.

With very kind regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

BOB CONNOR.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 TO SECOND REVISED MAXIMUM PRICE REGULATION 215—DISTRIBUTION YARD SALES OF SOFTWOOD, EFFECTIVE APRIL 23, 1946

The Office of Price Administration today eliminated the requirement that new distribution yards apply to OPA for permission to sell at distribution yard maximum prices. Now all that is required for a new yard is to file a statement with the nearest OPA district office indicating its qualification as a distribution yard.

Today's action, effective April 23, 1946, also has the effect of removing all limitations as to interests which can operate distribution yards.

At the same time the definition of a distribution yard is tightened so that mark-ups will be used only by authentic wholesale and retail yard operations. Prior to the action, applications from mills, lumber wholesalers, and affiliated interests to establish lumber distribution yards have been denied in order to prevent lumber which should be sold at mill prices from being routed through distribution yards and sold at the higher distribution yard prices.

Yards which have no mill connections and are entirely independent of a producing mill will have no difficulty in qualifying under the definition. Distribution yards which are part of mill operations may have to adjust their operations somewhat; they may have to establish separate bank accounts for the distribution yard, assign personnel to run the

yards without participating in mill operations, and keep separate records and inventories as well as profit-and-loss statements. However, if a combined yard-mill operation has not had sales of \$120,000 in any 12 months since January 1, 1943, this provision will not be applicable.

A location safeguard was incorporated into today's action in order to check the use of yards merely as a means of getting retail prices from lumber normally sold direct from mill to consumer.

The location provision prohibits the sale of carload quantities for rail shipment or any quantity by water at higher than mill prices if a distribution yard is connected with a producing operation by financial interest or family relationship and is located within 500 miles of the producing operation.

The action may result in some disadvantages to independent yards since it will permit an increasing amount of the available lumber supply to be routed through distribution yards having mill connections. These yards may find it difficult to purchase their lumber from mills which can be expected to open their own outlets of distribution. However, this action has the approval of the majority of members of the Softwood Distribution Yard Industry Advisory Committee. A suggestion that mill sales of lumber be earmarked, in relation to sales made in a base period, so that independent yards could be assured some direct-mill purchases, was not adopted after practically all elements of the retail lumber trade recommended that the restriction not be made.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION—SECOND REVISED MPR 215—AMENDMENT 20—APRIL 23, 1946

(Document No. 54036)

PART 1425—LUMBER DISTRIBUTION—SECOND REVISED MPR 215, AMENDMENT 20—DISTRIBUTION YARD SALES OF SOFTWOOD

A statement of the considerations involved in the issuance of this amendment has been issued simultaneously herewith and filed with the Division of the Federal Register.

Second Revised Maximum Price Regulation 215 is amended in the following respects:

1. Section 3 (a) is amended to read as follows:

(a) Transactions covered: This regulation covers all sales out of distribution yard stock of products covered by this regulation within the continental limits of the United States made by lumber distribution yards whether wholesale or retail, except that where a distribution yard has any connection, either financially or through family relationships, with any lumber producing operation, and such distribution yard is located within 500 miles of such lumber producing operation, sales of lumber for rail shipment in carload quantities or water shipment in any quantity out of stock of such distribution yard whether freight cost is borne by the buyer or seller shall not be covered by this regulation. Sales of lumber from distribution yard stock not covered by this regulation shall be subject to the applicable mill regulation governing the species sold.

2. Section 16 (a) is amended to read as follows:

(a) A distribution yard for the purpose of this regulation means an establishment which meets all of the following requirements:

(1) It obtains lumber from mills, concentration yards, wholesalers or other distribution yards and unloads, sorts, stores, and resells such lumber.

(2) It regularly maintains for sale an inventory of varied items, species, and classes of lumber, lumber products, and other building materials.

(3) It obtains its lumber, except for local species, mostly by rail or water and sells mostly for truck shipment, being stocked and equipped to make prompt delivery of different items of lumber items of lumber products out of its yard.

(4) It furnishes on all sales the usual distribution yard services, such as accepting returns, making exchanges, filling shortages from stock.

(5) It has an office and records at the yard site, is manned by a crew employed by the yard, and exclusively owns or controls all facilities of such establishment and uses the same for the handling and sale of the material bought and sold by it.

(6) It is a separate and distinct operation from any concentration yard or mill operation as defined in the applicable mill regulation governing the species sold. For purposes of this requirement, such an establishment is not a separate and distinct operation unless it maintains for its use, exclusive of use by any mill or concentration yard, the following separate facilities, site, equipment, personnel and records, for the handling and sale of material of the distribution yard: yard and shed, offices, yard help, sales force, managerial staff, stock of lumber, inventory records, books of account, bank account, detailed charges to inventory by price, grade, and sizes of items, and operating and profit and loss statements, none of which are used in connection with the operation of a mill or concentration yard as defined in the applicable mill regulation governing the species sold; *Provided, however*, That where a distribution yard has been continuously operating on the same site as a mill or concentration yard since prior to January 1, 1943, the requirement that it shall be situated at a separate site shall not apply, and provided further that where a distribution yard has been continuously operating on the same site as a mill or concentration yard since prior to January 1, 1943, and the total sales volume including all building materials of such combined operation has not exceeded \$120,000 during any 12-month period since prior to January 1, 1943, the requirement that the above-mentioned facilities need to be separately maintained shall not apply.

3. Section 16 is amended to add the following paragraphs:

(j) Financial connections: Financial connection means all circumstances of partial or total common ownership or beneficial interest, or profit or loss sharing arrangements.

(k) Family relationship: Family relationship means any person related to the seller or to the seller's spouse within the fifth degree either by blood or marriage.

4. Section 23 is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 23. New yards: Before making any sales of lumber at the maximum prices established by this regulation, any person who has set up or sets up a wholesale or retail distribution yard after December 31, 1942, but who has not received specific approval in writing from the Office of Price Administration of his use of the maximum prices established by this regulation on his sales of lumber must file with the Office of Price Administration District Office nearest the location of his establishment a letter reading as follows:

"I (We) propose to establish a lumber distribution yard as defined in section 16 of 2d Revised Maximum Price Regulation 215, Distribution Yard Sales of Softwood. This yard will be known as _____ (give name of company), will be operated as a _____ (wholesale or retail, specify which) lumber distribution yard, and will be located at _____ (give address of yard).

"(Signed) _____"

This Amendment No. 20 shall become effective April 23, 1946.

NOTE.—All reporting requirements of this amendment have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with the Federal Reports Act of 1942.

Issued this 23 day of April 1946.

PAUL A. PORTER,
Administrator.

STATEMENT OF CONSIDERATIONS ACCOMPANYING
AMENDMENT No. 20 TO SECOND REVISED MAX-
IMUM PRICE REGULATION No. 215

This amendment revises the definition of a distribution yard, and at the same time eliminates the requirement that new yards apply to the Office of Price Administration for permission to use the distribution yard mark-ups provided by the regulation. Instead, a new yard will now merely be required to file a statement with the nearest Office of Price Administration District Office indicating that it is a bona fide distribution yard under the revised definition and that it intends to use the distribution yard mark-ups. Sellers who previously have restricted or limited approval from the Office of Price Administration and who qualify as distribution yards under the revised definition, after filing such a statement, will be able to sell at the distribution yard mark-ups authorized by this regulation without regard to the limitations previously imposed.

Prior to the issuance of this amendment, every yard newly established or acquired by new interests was required to apply to the Office of Price Administration for authorization to use the distribution yard mark-ups before selling at distribution yard prices. This provision was considered necessary in order to insure insofar as practicable that lumber which would normally be sold on direct mill shipments at the mill level of price would not be diverted unnecessarily through new distribution yards for the purpose of obtaining higher prices for such lumber and that lumber would not be diverted to new distributive channels connected with mills to the detriment of the buyer who normally obtained lumber in carload quantities directly from the mill. These applications were processed on the basis of objective standards applied uniformly and generally to all applicants. Under these standards, authorization to use the distribution yard mark-ups was granted only to yards which were free of financial or family connections with lumber producing or wholesaling operations. Such standards were intended to result in generally fair treatment for all applicants and at the same time achieve the primary purpose of the section which was to prevent unnecessary routing of lumber through distribution yards by the technique of setting up new yards.

The procedure has imposed a severe and growing burden on this Office, resulting in increasing difficulty in making the necessary investigations and acting promptly on the applications received. At the same time it has not been certain that the screening process sufficiently controls unnecessary diversion of lumber through distribution yards to justify the effort involved. A very high proportion of the large number of new yards approved have been located in the areas of important lumber production, raising a question as to whether unnecessary routing is not occurring despite the screening of new applications. Moreover, the scrutiny of new yards has not prevented established yards from acquiring interests in producing mills, or from routing through their yards an increasing volume of lumber produced by the mills under their control. To the extent that this seems to have occurred, limitations on the opening of new yards are discriminatory, and the purpose of such limitation is circumvented.

To relieve the administrative burden and remove the discriminatory features and yet accomplish the purpose of preventing unnecessary routing of lumber through distribution yards as effectively as possible, this action, while removing all limitations as to the interests which can operate new distribution yards, considerably tightens the definition of a lumber distribution yard that is entitled to use the mark-ups provided by Second Revised Maximum Price Regulation 215. Any yard which is entirely independent of a producing mill will have no difficulty in meeting the definition. Certain bona fide distribution yards which have mill connections may be required to adjust their operations somewhat, as by establishing a separate bank account for the yard, by assigning personnel and managerial staff which will devote their efforts to the distribution yard exclusive of any participation in management or operation of the lumber mill or other producing operation, and by keeping separate inventory records on yard stock, by preparing a separate profit and loss statement. Where total sales of the combined operation have not exceeded \$120,000 in any 12 months' period since January 1, 1943, however, these requirements for segregation of operations from mill or concentration yard operations do not apply, as it is considered an undue burden on such small operators who have historically functioned without separate establishments to be compelled to do so now.

All members of the Softwood Distribution Yard Industry Advisory Committee were requested to review these requirements. Except on one or two points there was unanimous agreement of those expressing an opinion that the requirements were not unduly onerous to a bona fide distribution yard, and with respect to these points a majority of the members responding agreed that it was proper to require compliance with them.

These requirements are expected to assure, so far as practicable, that the customary distribution-yard services normally offered in connection with the yard sales of softwood lumber are available to the purchaser and performed when required, and that lumber yards will not be used as an expedient for obtaining distribution-yard prices for lumber which is essentially sold direct from the mill to the consumer. Further to assure this, it is provided that a distribution yard connected with a producing operation by financial interest or family relationship and located within 500 miles of such producing operation may not sell carload quantities for rail shipment or any quantity for water shipment at other than mill prices. A yard located at a greater distance will necessarily be outside the principal producing area and located in an area of lumber consumption. It will have a local market for its lumber generally sufficient for its available supply, and there will be no need to make carload rail shipments or water shipments which are the type that should be supplied direct from the mill at mill prices and which, when made by a yard, as a frequent practice in common items, carry a presumption of unnecessary routing of lumber through distribution-yard channels.

It is recognized that this amendment, while assuring that lumber sold at distribution-yard prices is made through a bona fide distribution-yard sale, may, nevertheless, permit an increasing amount of the available lumber supply to be routed through distribution yards having some connection with a mill. This may operate to the disadvantage of other distribution yards and other purchasers without mill associations which normally obtained their lumber in carload quantities at mill prices. Such purchasers may find it increasingly difficult to obtain lumber except at distribution-yard prices

from yards associated with mills resulting in higher costs and greatly reduced margins for the independent yard. To the extent that distribution-yard prices permit an unusually favorable profit to the distributor of lumber assured of a direct mill supply, this possibility is enhanced. Despite this possibility, however, the provisions of this amendment have the approval of the majority of the members of the Softwood Distribution Yard Industry Advisory Committee.

As one alternative to this action, careful consideration was given to a provision intended to minimize the diversion of lumber to yards with mill connections by prohibiting yards associated with mills from selling at distribution-yard prices any larger amount of lumber produced by associated mills than was sold by such yards in a base period, with the effect of earmarking a definite proportion of the lumber produced for direct mill purchases in carload quantities for independent retail yards as well as large consumers. All elements of the retail lumber industry which have expressed themselves with respect to it have recommended that such a restriction not be made. In view of these recommendations and since such a restriction might require drastic readjustment of the sales allocation of some existing sellers, the Administrator has not adopted it.

Prior to the issuance of this amendment the Price Administrator has consulted so far as practicable with representatives of the industry and has given consideration to their recommendations.

All provisions of this amendment and their effect upon business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution in the industry or industries affected have been carefully considered. No provisions which might have the effect of requiring a change in such practices, methods, means, or aids have been included in the amendment unless such provisions have been found necessary to achieve effective price control and to prevent circumvention or evasion of the amendment or of the act. To the extent that the provisions of this amendment compel or may operate to compel changes in business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution established in the industry or industries affected, such provisions are necessary to prevent circumvention of this amendment or of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

In view of the above considerations, the Administrator finds that this amendment is necessary and proper and consistent with the purposes and standards of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and with the Executive orders of the President.

Issued this 23d day of April 1946.

PAUL A. PORTER,
Administrator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall not burden the Senate with reading regulation No. 20, which went into effect on the 23d of April, but I shall state its effect. I do so because the OPA makes the same statement in its explanation, which will appear in their statement in connection with the order, namely, that they were unable to enforce their own regulation preventing producers, that is, the loggers and the log operators, from operating retail lumber yards. There was a regulation against that, but they admit here that they could not enforce it. Therefore what does OPA do? It abolishes the regulation, and now allows the wholesale producer of lumber to open up retail yards at will. He can sell all he desires, providing he does not sell in carload lots, under 500 miles from the location of

his factory, or his producing area, and he cannot ship it in shipload lots within 500 miles.

The practice has grown up, ever since that order went into effect, on April 23, for the great majority of lumber producers, instead of selling on the wholesale market to retail lumber yards throughout the Middle West and the East, to open up their own retail yards and sell their own products at retail prices, in locations near the lumber centers, thereby getting, not only the wholesale profit, if any, which they had been getting, but the entire retail profit as well, and the retail lumber dealer must either buy the lumber at retail, and then merely trade dollars, and pay the expenses of transportation, or not get it, and have to shut up shop.

The Middle West lumber dealer, the man who cannot truck the lumber, who lives so far away from the logging centers and the mill centers that he cannot truck, either is out of business today, or will be shortly, when his present supplies are exhausted.

OPA has now put the cap sheaf, in my opinion, if it continues this order, upon the shock of destruction of the retail lumbermen of the Middle West and East.

I suggest that in the consideration of OPA policy, and of what they are doing through the outlets and distribution centers of this country, Members of the Senate read carefully not only the order, but OPA's own explanation of its inability to enforce its own regulations which it once thought were good, but now is discarding, having gone over to the side of the "enemy," so to speak, and under which practice they are permitting the doing legally of the very things which a few weeks ago they said were atrocious, and were destructive of public morals under a price policy.

Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate another activity of OPA. I have in my hand a form letter, one of a good many such letters which were sent out of the district office of OPA in the city of Des Moines. The letter is dated May 6, 1946. I have another such form letter dated May 7. I have several such letters. The ones I have seem to be dated May 6 or May 7. The letter is addressed:

A. I. MADDEN,
Insurance Exchange Building,
Des Moines, Iowa.

DEAR SIR—

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that this is a mimeographed form letter with blanks left at certain places in the letter to fill in the appropriate data applicable to the addressee. The letter proceeds—On February 20, 1946, a certificate of transfer was filed with your local board for a (new) automobile purchased by you. An investigation is now being conducted with reference to the sales made by—

And then there is filled in typewriting the name "Jensen-Dunn Co."

I call attention, Mr. President, to the last sentence:

An investigation is now being conducted with reference to the sales made by Jensen-Dunn Co.

The letter continues:

Will you please call at your local price-control board, 525 Sixth Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa, room No. 208, on May 10, 1946, at 2 p. m., bringing with you all papers in your possession pertaining to the above-mentioned automobile, so that a representative of this office can discuss the purchase with you?

If the time designated for your appearance is not convenient, will you please call your price-control board to arrange for a more convenient time?

Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

MAURICE L. MERRITT,
Chief, Rent and Durable Goods
Enforcement Section.

(For the district enforcement attorney.)

I have a number of such letters which were sent to purchasers of new automobiles. The startling thing about this is that every one of them refers to a new automobile sold by as reputable automobile dealers as there are in the United States, by men that I know of, by business concerns that I know of, businesses upon which no stain of law violation or culpability has ever been placed. They are men who have built businesses over the years in that city. I have received only eight or ten such letters in response to the hurried request I made for them; but I am informed that the district office of OPA, by direction of Washington, is ordering these circular letters to be sent out, and I believe is also doing the same thing in Milwaukee, and I believe in certain areas in the South, literally charging responsible and decent businessmen, at least they are such in the eyes of their customers, with probably being law violators and criminals, when the customer himself has made no complaint, and has no complaint, and when in fact in most instances the OPA has never questioned the dealer, and when there is not in fact, so far as the dealer knows, any investigation of his activities or his sales prices. As I happen to know, because I have received communications from them, it has raised in the minds of a number of persons, the fear that perhaps this old-established company has suddenly become a criminal, a black-market operator, and that the new cars they bought, based upon ceiling prices, based upon regulations, may in some way involve the customers in some illegal act.

Mr. President, it is the most insidious assault and presumption of criminality directed against honest and decent businessmen by a Government agency, if you please by their Government, that I have ever seen. It smacks of the OGPU and the Gestapo.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator been able to discover why these letters are being sent out? Does the Senator know what the real purpose of the OPA is in sending them out?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that I have not received any explanation from the OPA. I received the letters only today. I have letters applicable to about five

different automobile companies in Des Moines. All of them are reliable business concerns. My information is that none of these automobile companies has been visited by an OPA representative or a checker; that the companies themselves have not been under investigation, so far as they know, and yet their customers of long standing come in in fear and trembling lest those with whom they have done business for many years in the past have suddenly become black marketers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The reason for my inquiry was that I recall representatives of the OPA coming before the Committee on Appropriations on various occasions and requesting more money, with the statement that they needed the additional money for investigating purposes. I wonder whether this is not a case of their using money so appropriated to make investigations when there is no need and no cause whatsoever for making them, when there is not even, as we usually say, a suspicion that there has been a violation, let alone real evidence of one. We in the Senate should know if OPA is using the money appropriated to it to send out such letters as the Senator has referred to, asking the buyer of an automobile to come forward and make a report with respect to his purchase of an automobile.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And, I might add, raising the unjust suspicion in the minds of law abiding citizens that the business establishments which have been in existence in these towns for many years have become criminals.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. The tendency today on the part of OPA seems to be to want to discredit business. To go to a man's customer and inquire whether he has committed a crime could be one method and a very effective method of discrediting business. I do not believe that money was appropriated for the purpose of sending out such letters or for the purpose of discrediting honest, reliable businessmen in the sale of automobiles or of any other products.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, as I have said, I have information that the same thing is being done in Milwaukee, Wis., and in certain places in the South, I believe in Georgia, and in many other places the exact location of which I do not now know. This act on the part of OPA may be likened, if such were the case, to the prosecutor of the District of Columbia in some way obtaining a customer list of the fine retail stores of the District of Columbia, and, without ever sending investigators into the stores, circularizing the customer lists, let us say of Woodward & Lothrop, or any of the other stores of the District, and saying to the customers, "The store from which you made these purchases is under investigation by OPA to see whether they have gouged you on prices or are guilty of criminal activities. Will you please bring in your records." It amounts to the same thing as

circulating the whole customer list of the store, when as a matter of fact no investigation had ever been instituted at the source of the alleged inquiry.

Mr. President, I say that it smacks of methods which are not American investigative methods; they are not methods within the accepted province and the accepted activities of American prosecutors. They are not methods which are calculated to inspire confidence on the part of the public, but are methods of Government confusion, Government fear, Government doubt, and Government oppression.

I do not have any doubt in my own mind that there are countless instances in this country of violations of automobile ceilings, but I will say that I think the overwhelming violations of regulations respecting sale and transfer of automobiles are occurring in what might be called the black market, fly-by-night field of operators in the automobile business, and not by the legitimate, well-established and long-established men of the community who have built their businesses and their reputations in the past upon public confidence. Letters of this kind will destroy the public confidence in legitimate businessmen and established firms quicker than any other method, for suspicion, over the signature of Government officials, is implanted in the minds of customers that their friend, from whom they have bought automobiles, and who is well established, may be a criminal. "We are investigating."

Mr. President, I shall have more to say later on this subject. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter to which I referred, as an illustration of a number of such letters which I have received.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Des Moines, Iowa, May 6, 1946.

A. I. MADDEN,
Insurance Exchange Building,
Des Moines, Iowa.

DEAR SIR: On February 20, 1946, a certificate of transfer was filed with your local board for a (new) automobile purchased by you. An investigation is now being conducted with reference to the sales made by Jensen-Dunn Co.

Will you please call at your local price-control board, 525 Sixth Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa, room No. 208, on May 10, 1946, at 2 p. m. bringing with you all papers in your possession pertaining to the above-mentioned automobile, so that a representative of this office can discuss the purchase with you.

If the time designated for your appearance is not convenient, will you please call your local price-control board to arrange for a more convenient time.

Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

MAURICE L. MERRITT,
Chief, Rent and Durable Goods
Enforcement Section.

(For the district enforcement attorney.)

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. At this time I merely wanted to call the attention of the Senate to the activity and the meth-

ods that OPA is even now pursuing in these days of reconversion, and I call it to the attention of the Senate because I think it merits serious consideration and attention by Members of this body.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the 'Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946'.

"INCREASE IN CLASSIFICATION ACT PAY RATES

"SEC. 2. (a) Each of the existing rates of basic compensation provided by section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended and supplemented, except those affected by subsection (b) of this section, is hereby increased by 14 per centum or \$250 per annum, whichever is the greater, except that no such rate shall be increased by more than 25 per centum. Such augmented rates shall be considered to be the regular rates of basic compensation provided by such section.

"(b) (1) The proviso to the fifth paragraph under the heading 'Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Service' in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Provided, That charwomen working part time be paid at the rate of 90 cents an hour, and head charwomen at the rate of 95 cents an hour'.

"(2) Such section is amended so as to provide the following rates of compensation for positions in the clerical-mechanical service:

"Grade 1, 90 to 97 cents an hour.

"Grade 2, \$1.04 to \$1.12 an hour.

"Grade 3, \$1.20 to \$1.27 an hour.

"Grade 4, \$1.35 to \$1.49 an hour.

"(c) The increase in existing rates of basic compensation provided by this section shall not be construed to be an 'equivalent increase' in compensation within the meaning of section 7 (b) (1) of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"INCREASE IN PAY RATES FOR CUSTOMS CLERKS AND IMMIGRANT INSPECTORS

"SEC. 3. Each of the existing rates of basic compensation provided by the Act entitled 'An Act to adjust the compensation of certain employees in the Customs Service', approved May 29, 1928, as amended and supplemented, and those provided by the second paragraph of section 24 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended and supplemented, are hereby increased by 14 per centum or \$250 per annum, whichever is the greater, except that no such rate shall be increased by more than 25 per centum. Such augmented rates shall be considered to be the regular rates of basic compensation.

"INCREASE IN STATUTORY PAY RATES IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH NOT UNDER CLASSIFICATION ACT

"SEC. 4. Rates of basic compensation specifically provided by statute (including any increase therein computed in accordance with

section 602 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945) for positions in the executive branch or the District of Columbia municipal government which are not included in section 102, as amended, of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 or in the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, and are not increased by any other provision of this Act, are hereby increased by 14 per centum or \$250 per annum, whichever is the greater, except that no such rate shall be increased by more than 25 per centum. Such augmented rates shall be considered to be the regular rates of basic compensation.

"INCREASE IN PAY RATES IN THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

"SEC. 5. (a) The first sentence of section 501 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'plus (A) 14 per centum of his rate of compensation (including the additions thereto resulting from the application of the foregoing percentages), or (B) \$250 per annum, whichever is the greater, except that such rate of compensation shall not be increased by more than 25 per centum'.

"(b) The second sentence of such section 501 is amended to read as follows: 'The additional compensation provided by this section and section 502 shall be considered a part of the basic compensation of any such officer or employee for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.'

"(c) Section 502 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION IN LIEU OF OVERTIME

"SEC. 502. Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch entitled to the benefits of section 501 of this Act shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 10 per centum of the aggregate of the rate of his basic compensation and the rate of additional compensation received by him under section 501 of this Act.'

"INCREASE IN PAY RATES IN THE JUDICIAL BRANCH

"SEC. 6. (a) The first sentence of section 521 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'plus (A) 14 per centum of his rate of compensation (including the additions thereto resulting from the application of the foregoing percentages), or (B) \$250 per annum, whichever is the greater, except that such rate of compensation shall not be increased by more than 25 per centum'.

"(b) The second sentence of such section 521 is amended to read as follows: 'The limitations of \$5,500 and \$7,500 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the eighth paragraph under the head 'Miscellaneous Items of Expense' in The Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1946 (Public Law Numbered 61, Seventy-ninth Congress), or in any subsequent appropriation Act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this section; and the changes in the rates of basic compensation in the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, made by section 405 of this Act and section 2 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall not be taken into account in fixing salaries under any such appropriation Act.'

"(c) Section 522 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION IN LIEU OF OVERTIME

"SEC. 522. (a) Each officer and employee of the Supreme Court of the United States entitled to the benefits of section 521 of this

Act shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 10 per centum of the rate of his basic compensation. As used in this subsection the term "basic compensation" includes the additional basic compensation provided by section 521 of this Act.

"(b) The additional compensation provided by subsection (a) of this section shall be considered a part of the basic compensation of any such officer or employee for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended."

"LIMITATION ON AGGREGATE RATE PAYABLE"

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting after the words 'by reason of the enactment of this Act' the words 'or any amendment thereto'.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no officer or employee shall, by reason of the enactment of this Act, be paid with respect to any pay period, basic compensation, or basic compensation plus any additional compensation provided by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, at a rate in excess of \$10,000 per annum.

"VESSEL EMPLOYEES"

"SEC. 8. (a) Section 102 (d) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) This Act, except sections 606 and 607, shall not apply to employees of the Transportation Corps of the Army of the United States on vessels operated by the United States, to vessel employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to vessel employees of the Department of the Interior, or to vessel employees of the Panama Railroad Company."

"(b) Section 606 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"VESSEL EMPLOYEES"

"SEC. 606. Employees of the Transportation Corps of the Army of the United States on vessels operated by the United States, vessel employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, vessel employees of the Department of the Interior, and vessel employees of the Panama Railroad Company, may be compensated in accordance with the wage practices of the maritime industry."

"COMPENSATORY TIME OFF FOR IRREGULAR OR OCCASIONAL OVERTIME WORK"

"SEC. 9. Section 202 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by striking out 'forty-eight hours' and inserting in lieu thereof 'forty hours'.

"NIGHT PAY DIFFERENTIAL"

"SEC. 10. That part of section 301 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 which precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows: 'Any officer or employee to whom this title applies who is assigned to a regularly scheduled tour of duty, any part of which including overtime, falls between the hours of 6 o'clock postmeridian and 6 o'clock antemeridian, shall, for duty between such hours, excluding periods when he is in a leave status, be paid compensation at a rate 10 per centum in excess of his rate of basic compensation for duty between other hours.'

"PAY FOR HOLIDAY WORK"

"SEC. 11. That part of the first sentence of section 302 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 which precedes the proviso is amended to read as follows: 'Any officer or employee to whom this title applies who is assigned to duty on a holiday designated by Federal statute or Executive order during hours which fall within his basic administrative work-week of forty hours shall be compensated for not to exceed eight hours of such duty, excluding periods when he is in a leave status, in lieu of his regular rate of basic compensation for such duty, at the rate of

twice such regular rate of basic compensation, in addition to any extra compensation for night duty provided by section 301 of this Act.'

"PAY RATES FOR GRADES 9 AND 10 OF THE CRAFTS, PROTECTIVE, AND CUSTODIAL SERVICE OF THE CLASSIFICATION ACT"

"SEC. 12. (a) Section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the second paragraph relating to grade 9 of the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Service and substituting therefor the following:

"The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$2,870, \$2,980, \$3,090, \$3,200, \$3,310, \$3,420, and \$3,530."

"(b) Section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the second paragraph relating to grade 10 of the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Service and substituting therefor the following:

"The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$3,200, \$3,310, \$3,420, \$3,530, \$3,640, \$3,750, and \$3,860."

"(c) With respect to grades 9 and 10 of the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Service, the increase in rates of basic compensation provided by section 2 of this Act shall be computed on the rates of basic compensation established for such grades, as amended by subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

"GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE"

SEC. 13. This Act and any other general legislation heretofore or hereafter enacted governing the employment, compensation, emoluments, and status of officers and employees of the United States shall apply to officers and employees of the General Accounting Office in the same manner and to the same extent as if such officers and employees were in or under the executive branch of the Government.

"PERSONNEL CEILINGS"

"SEC. 14. (a) Section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) (1) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (b) of this section—

"(A) with respect to the departments (other than the Department of War and the Department of the Navy), establishments, and agencies (including Government-owned or controlled corporations) in the executive branch, the Director shall so determine the numbers of full-time civilian employees and the man-months of part-time employment on the basis of the relative needs of such departments, establishments, and agencies for personnel, that the aggregate number of such civilian employees (including the full-time equivalent of man-months of part-time employment) shall not exceed (i) five hundred and twenty-eight thousand nine hundred and seventy-five for the quarter beginning October 1, 1946; (ii) five hundred and one thousand seven hundred and seventy-one for the quarter beginning January 1, 1947; (iii) four hundred and seventy-four thousand five hundred and sixty-seven for the quarter beginning April 1, 1947; and (iv) four hundred and forty-seven thousand three hundred and sixty-three after June 30, 1947;

"(B) with respect to the Department of War and the Department of the Navy, the Director shall so determine the numbers of civilian employees (including the full-time equivalent of man-months of part-time employment) that at the earliest date practicable, but in no event later than July 1, 1947, the number shall not exceed one hundred and seventy-six thousand with respect to the Department of War, or one hundred thousand with respect to the Department of the Navy.

The numbers of employees specified in this paragraph shall be regarded as maximum numbers, and nothing herein shall be construed to limit the authority of the Director to establish lower aggregate numbers whenever, in his opinion, the numbers so specified are in excess of those necessary for the proper and efficient exercise of the authorized functions of the departments, establishments, and agencies to which this subsection applies. The procedural provisions of subsection (b) of this section shall be applicable with respect to determinations under this paragraph.

"(2) No provision of law heretofore or hereafter enacted authorizing the employment of personnel by, or appropriating funds for the compensation of personnel of, or conferring additional functions upon, any department, establishment, or agency, shall be construed to authorize the employment of, or payment of compensation to, a greater number of employees subject to this subsection than the number so determined by the Director with respect to such department, establishment, or agency unless such provision of law specifically authorizes the employment or payment of salaries of personnel in excess of such number, or exempts such department, establishment, or agency from the provisions of this subsection, and any such employment or payment not so authorized shall be deemed to be a violation of the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 31, sec. 665).

"(3) The provisions of this subsection shall not apply with respect to employees whose basic compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose. The provisions of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department or to officers and employees of the Veterans' Administration, but shall apply with respect to officers and employees outside the United States whose compensation is fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and who are not excluded from the provisions of this section by the provisions of subsection (f). The provisions of subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to officers and employees outside the several States and the District of Columbia."

"(b) Effective October 1, 1946, subsection (f) of such section is amended by striking out '(1) employees of the War and Navy Departments except those who are subject to the provisions of titles II and III of this Act; or (2)'

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED"

"SEC. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"EFFECTIVE DATE"

"SEC. 16. This Act, except section 14 (b), shall take effect on July 1, 1946."

And the House agree to the same.

That the title of the bill be amended to read as follows: "An act to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes."

SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
HARRY BYRD,
B. B. HICKENLOOPER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
EDWARD H. REES,
JOHN W. BYRNES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the conference report has been accepted by the House, and I move its adoption by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that as a conferee I did not sign the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the chief point in this conference report to which the attention of the Senate should first be directed is that the bill provides for a 14-percent increase in present salaries. In addition there is a somewhat greater increase in some of the lower brackets, by providing for a minimum increase of \$250 unless the increase exceeds 25 percent of the existing salary, when the limitation is a 25-percent increase. Those figures may seem rather peculiar, but we have part-time workers and messenger boys, and a large number of other employees who are in the very lowest paid category.

The Senate may perhaps best understand how the bill works out in that respect from the reading of a brief summary on the effect of those figures.

Any employee now receiving less than \$1,000 a year receives an increase of 25 percent. Any employee receiving \$1,000 or more, but less than \$1,785.71 receives an increase of \$250. Any employee receiving \$1,785.71 or more receives a 14 percent increase, except that he cannot receive more than \$10,000. The last statement illustrates one of the provisions of the bill. We have established a ceiling of \$10,000 beyond which no worker can go because of the present increase of 14 percent. As a matter of fact, that provision continues in effect the provision of the July 1, 1945, bill.

No Senator can properly judge this bill unless he takes into consideration the fact that less than a year ago we granted a substantial increase to all Federal employees in the classified branch, with which the bill deals. At that time we granted an increase of 20 percent on the first \$1,200 of salary, 10 percent increase on all salary from \$1,200 to \$4,600, and a 5 percent increase on all amounts above that figure.

The bill does not give quite the increase which I desired and for which I argued on the floor of the Senate. Figured over-all, it gives 15 percent. The bill which I originally introduced, and which I should like to have had passed then, and would like to have passed now, provided for a 20 percent increase. However, in frankness, I must admit that the ultimate working out of both bills is a most satisfactory result, although not quite what I would want. A very much larger increase has been given in the lower brackets, and quite a substantial increase in the upper brackets. If we take the effect of both bills together—

the one of last July and the one of this July—we start with the lowest salary of \$720 for messenger boys and others in the lower paid category. The two bills give them a 50 percent increase. That increase is gradually decreased as the salary scale goes up. At \$8,000 the bill now provides a total increase of 24.7 percent. The present cost of living is up approximately 35 percent, so that those in the higher brackets still lack approximately 10 points, in their increase, below the increase in the cost of living.

The conference report was signed by all the conferees on the part of the House. It was signed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and myself on behalf of the Senate. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] did not sign the conference report. After I conclude he will state his objections to it.

The House had passed a bill providing for a \$400 flat increase, which would have resulted in approximately a 17 percent increase over-all. The Senate had passed a graduated salary bill providing for an 11 percent increase over-all. This is an intermediate bill. It gives a certain flat increase, of \$250, in the lower brackets, and it provides for considerable help in the upper brackets.

I believe that if the Federal Government is going to retain from private industry its very best men there must be some increase beyond \$10,000; and in my opinion new salary brackets should be created up to \$15,000. But Congress did not see fit to do so in this legislation. Very possibly that issue will be raised next year, as to whether we should have additional higher categories, and whether we should raise the ceiling.

I believe that the Congress of the United States may, in one sense, be congratulated on this bill. Under the democratic processes of our Government, in the free conference of the House and Senate in the deliberations on this bill, many vigorous things were said, and both Senate and House conferees emphatically expressed their views. As a final result, after deliberations which were aggressive and impatient at times, but I think always tolerant and fair, we finally arrived at this bill.

As a result of these two bills, I am proud to assert something which I do not think can be denied—that Federal employees, comprising a total of approximately 2,000,000 in number, although less than 1,000,000 are directly affected by the bill, are, in the lower category, substantially better paid than in private industry. Furthermore, Federal workers have a month's vacation as compared with approximately 2 weeks in private industry. Moreover they have a very helpful and fine civil-service retirement annuity, to which the Government contributes about 50 percent. I think it is fortunate to have this example at this time, without any strikes or great stress or loss of labor. Under the democratic process of give and take, without coer-

cion or undue strife, we have worked out a bill which may not satisfy all Senators. Some Senators may think that the increase is too high in some respects. It will not satisfy other Senators because they think it is too low. But at least it is a fairly good bill, and well comparable with the results accomplished by strike methods. In this instance the result was obtained without any of those unhappy incidents.

There is another major feature of the bill, which I will ask the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to discuss, because they took a more active part in obtaining those provisions than I did.

It seems to be the general opinion of the Civil Service Committees of both the House and Senate, and of the Congress, that in certain of the agencies there is overstaffing and considerable waste of manpower. We believe that in other agencies the employees are working faithfully and energetically, and that full use is being made of manpower. The whole problem is so vast that reform is rather difficult.

The bill contains a provision agreed upon in the conference which at least is an attempt to secure greater economy in the use of Federal manpower. Expressing it in very general terms, although it is a technical subject and there are many details, it is an attempt to place ceilings by this bill upon Federal employment, by virtue of which, over the next fiscal year, commencing October 1, it will be the duty of the officials in charge of Federal employment to absorb three-quarters of the cost of the bill by decreasing Federal employment. That ceiling does not apply to the Veterans' Administration. It does not apply to wage-board employees, and it does not apply to the Post Office Department.

We have established a different kind of ceiling for the Army and Navy Departments, requiring them to reach a certain number of personnel by July 1, 1947. How effective the ceiling will be, and to what extent it may be set aside by later acts of Congress—as it may be, within the power of Congress—no one can say.

There are certain other details in the bill dealing with increased pay on holidays and at nighttime, which are beneficial to the workers, but I shall not recite them, because they are rather inconsequential.

I believe that is all I have to say. As I have already stated, the House has agreed to the conference report. All the House conferees have signed the report and are for it. I believe that the bill as it comes from the conference is considered a fairly satisfactory bill and a satisfactory solution. As I have stated, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] did not sign the report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the effect of the two last pay bills upon the compensation of the Federal employees be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Schedule of basic annual rates of compensation for positions subject to Classification Act of 1923, as amended

Old rate in effect prior to July 1, 1945	Present rate under Public Law 106, effective July 1, 1946	Proposed rate, 14 percent above present rate	Proposed increase over—			
			Old rate		Present rate	
			Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
\$720...	\$864.00	\$1,080.00	\$360.00	50.0	\$216.00	25.0
\$780...	936.00	1,170.00	390.00	50.0	234.00	25.0
\$840...	1,008.00	1,258.00	418.00	49.8	250.00	24.8
\$900...	1,080.00	1,330.00	430.00	47.8	250.00	23.1
\$960...	1,152.00	1,402.00	442.00	46.0	250.00	21.7
\$1,200...	1,440.00	1,690.00	490.00	40.8	250.00	17.4
\$1,260...	1,506.00	1,755.00	496.00	39.4	250.00	16.6
\$1,320...	1,572.00	1,822.00	502.00	38.0	250.00	15.9
\$1,380...	1,638.00	1,888.00	508.00	36.8	250.00	15.3
\$1,440...	1,704.00	1,954.00	514.00	35.7	250.00	14.7
\$1,500...	1,770.00	2,020.00	520.00	34.7	250.00	14.1
\$1,560...	1,836.00	2,093.00	533.00	34.2	257.00	14.0
\$1,620...	1,902.00	2,168.00	548.00	33.8	266.00	14.0
\$1,680...	1,968.00	2,243.00	563.00	33.5	275.00	14.0
\$1,740...	2,034.00	2,318.00	578.00	33.3	284.00	14.0
\$1,800...	2,100.00	2,394.00	594.00	33.0	294.00	14.0
\$1,860...	2,166.00	2,469.00	609.00	32.8	303.00	14.0
\$1,920...	2,232.00	2,544.00	624.00	32.5	312.00	14.0
\$1,980...	2,298.00	2,619.00	639.00	32.3	321.00	14.0
\$2,000...	2,320.00	2,644.00	644.00	32.2	324.00	14.0
\$2,040...	2,364.00	2,694.00	654.00	32.1	330.00	14.0
\$2,100...	2,430.00	2,770.00	670.00	31.9	340.00	14.0
\$2,160...	2,496.00	2,845.00	685.00	31.7	349.00	14.0
\$2,200...	2,540.00	2,895.00	695.00	31.6	355.00	14.0
\$2,220...	2,562.00	2,920.00	700.00	31.6	358.00	14.0
\$2,300...	2,650.00	3,021.00	721.00	31.3	371.00	14.0
\$2,400...	2,760.00	3,146.00	746.00	31.1	386.00	14.0
\$2,500...	2,870.00	3,271.00	771.00	30.9	401.00	14.0
\$2,600...	2,980.00	3,397.00	797.00	30.7	417.00	14.0
\$2,700...	3,090.00	3,522.00	822.00	30.5	432.00	14.0
\$2,800...	3,200.00	3,648.00	848.00	30.3	448.00	14.0
\$2,900...	3,310.00	3,773.00	873.00	30.1	463.00	14.0
\$3,000...	3,420.00	3,898.00	898.00	30.0	478.00	14.0
\$3,100...	3,530.00	4,024.00	924.00	29.8	494.00	14.0
\$3,200...	3,640.00	4,149.00	949.00	29.7	509.00	14.0
\$3,300...	3,750.00	4,275.00	975.00	29.5	525.00	14.0
\$3,400...	3,860.00	4,400.00	1,000.00	29.4	540.00	14.0
\$3,500...	3,970.00	4,525.00	1,025.00	29.3	555.00	14.0
\$3,600...	4,080.00	4,651.00	1,051.00	29.2	571.00	14.0
\$3,700...	4,190.00	4,776.00	1,076.00	29.1	586.00	14.0
\$3,800...	4,300.00	4,902.00	1,102.00	29.0	602.00	14.0
\$3,900...	4,410.00	5,027.00	1,127.00	28.9	617.00	14.0
\$4,000...	4,520.00	5,152.00	1,152.00	28.8	632.00	14.0
\$4,100...	4,630.00	5,278.00	1,178.00	28.7	648.00	14.0
\$4,200...	4,740.00	5,403.00	1,203.00	28.7	663.00	14.0
\$4,300...	4,850.00	5,528.00	1,228.00	28.5	679.00	14.0
\$4,400...	4,960.00	5,654.00	1,254.00	28.4	694.00	14.0
\$4,500...	5,070.00	5,779.00	1,280.00	28.4	710.00	14.0
\$4,600...	5,180.00	5,905.00	1,305.00	28.4	725.00	14.0
\$4,700...	5,290.00	6,030.00	1,330.00	28.0	740.00	14.0
\$4,800...	5,400.00	6,155.00	1,355.00	27.7	755.00	14.0
\$4,900...	5,510.00	6,280.00	1,380.00	27.4	770.00	14.0
\$5,000...	5,620.00	6,405.00	1,405.00	27.1	785.00	14.0
\$5,100...	5,730.00	6,530.00	1,430.00	26.8	800.00	14.0
\$5,200...	5,840.00	6,655.00	1,455.00	26.6	815.00	14.0
\$5,300...	5,950.00	6,780.00	1,480.00	26.4	830.00	14.0
\$5,400...	6,060.00	6,905.00	1,505.00	26.1	845.00	14.0
\$5,500...	6,170.00	7,030.00	1,530.00	25.9	860.00	14.0
\$5,600...	6,280.00	7,155.00	1,555.00	25.8	875.00	14.0
\$5,700...	6,390.00	7,280.00	1,580.00	25.6	890.00	14.0
\$5,800...	6,500.00	7,405.00	1,605.00	25.4	905.00	14.0
\$5,900...	6,610.00	7,530.00	1,630.00	25.4	920.00	14.0
\$6,000...	6,720.00	7,655.00	1,655.00	25.2	935.00	14.0
\$6,100...	6,830.00	7,780.00	1,680.00	25.0	950.00	14.0
\$6,200...	6,940.00	7,905.00	1,705.00	25.0	965.00	14.0
\$6,300...	7,050.00	8,030.00	1,730.00	25.0	980.00	14.0
\$6,400...	7,160.00	8,155.00	1,755.00	25.0	995.00	14.0
\$6,500...	7,270.00	8,280.00	1,780.00	25.0	1,010.00	14.0
\$6,600...	7,380.00	8,405.00	1,805.00	25.0	1,025.00	14.0
\$6,700...	7,490.00	8,530.00	1,830.00	25.0	1,040.00	14.0
\$6,800...	7,600.00	8,655.00	1,855.00	25.0	1,055.00	14.0
\$6,900...	7,710.00	8,780.00	1,880.00	25.0	1,070.00	14.0
\$7,000...	7,820.00	8,905.00	1,905.00	25.0	1,085.00	14.0
\$7,100...	7,930.00	9,030.00	1,930.00	25.0	1,100.00	14.0
\$7,200...	8,040.00	9,155.00	1,955.00	25.0	1,115.00	14.0
\$7,300...	8,150.00	9,280.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,130.00	14.0
\$7,400...	8,260.00	9,405.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,145.00	14.0
\$7,500...	8,370.00	9,530.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,160.00	14.0
\$7,600...	8,480.00	9,655.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,175.00	14.0
\$7,700...	8,590.00	9,780.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,190.00	14.0
\$7,800...	8,700.00	9,905.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,205.00	14.0
\$7,900...	8,810.00	10,030.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,220.00	14.0
\$8,000...	8,920.00	10,155.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,235.00	14.0
\$8,100...	9,030.00	10,280.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,250.00	14.0
\$8,200...	9,140.00	10,405.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,265.00	14.0
\$8,300...	9,250.00	10,530.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,280.00	14.0
\$8,400...	9,360.00	10,655.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,295.00	14.0
\$8,500...	9,470.00	10,780.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,310.00	14.0
\$8,600...	9,580.00	10,905.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,325.00	14.0
\$8,700...	9,690.00	11,030.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,340.00	14.0
\$8,800...	9,800.00	11,155.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,355.00	14.0
\$8,900...	9,910.00	11,280.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,370.00	14.0
\$9,000...	10,020.00	11,405.00	1,980.00	25.0	1,385.00	14.0

¹\$250 minimum increase, but not to exceed 25 percent of present rate; \$10,000 maximum salary.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will accept the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it was with the deepest regret that I found that I could not sign the conference report prepared by my associates. It is always a matter of regret when I cannot agree with other conferees, especially in view of the fact that the other three conferees,

the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. DOWNEY], were unanimously in agreement with the five Members of the House.

Some time ago the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, which, of course, is a Government agency, made an investigation. The Bureau stated that the least that an unmarried girl needed in order to live decently was \$1,920 a year. I believe that every Senator on this floor must know that, in view of the high rents and the high cost of living, if a young lady receives a salary of \$1,900 a year, she is not getting very much, especially when she has to buy War bonds and to spend money in other ways if she is going to have an annuity in her old age.

Mr. President, the five conferees on the part of the House who have signed this report, originally, in the bill passed by the House, asked for an increase of \$400 a year for Federal employees. The bill, according to the terms of the conference report, shows that the poorer an employee is the less he gets. The distinguished Senator from California said that the entire bill applies to approximately a million Federal employees, but, Mr. President, if the conference report is agreed to, about one-third of the 947,000 Federal employees will be called upon to live on the sum of \$1,785.71 a year, or less. I should like to see any Senator try to raise a family, even with one child, and live on \$1,785.71 a year. And we must realize that deductions for various purposes are made from the pay envelopes by the heads of the various departments.

Mr. President, to my mind the proposed increase is entirely insufficient. I think the amount for lower-bracket employees provided by the conference report is a disgrace to the Government. When we passed the postal-pay bill—and let me point out that some of the members of the committee dealing with this bill were on the committee dealing with the postal-pay bill—we made it retroactive to January 1. But this bill is not to be retroactive. The result is that we are discriminating against a group of employees totaling 947,000 persons.

Mr. President, the Federal employees cannot strike. I noticed in the newspaper the night before last that a Member of the Senate was reported as saying that he was introducing a bill to make it a criminal offense for any Federal employee to strike, or else to provide that at the time men and women are employed by the Federal Government they must sign a waiver of some kind, providing that they never can strike against the Government.

Mr. President, I have the highest regard for my distinguished colleagues; but under my oath and under my conscience, when I realize that one of the Government bureaus has said that a young girl, in order to live decently, must have a salary of \$1,920 a year, I simply will not and cannot vote in favor of paying the

heads of families only \$1,785.71 a year. There are thousands upon thousands of heads of families among the 947,000 Federal workers who are affected, and they are to receive only \$1,785.71 a year. I simply do not wish to sign the name of WILLIAM LANGER to any kind of conference report which would put over that kind of a deal on those poor people who, in my opinion, have been underpaid for a long time.

It is true that the proposal looks wonderful; it is true that it looks fine. We are told that some Federal workers will receive a 50-percent increase in pay. But what does it amount to? It is a 50-percent increase over 1927 wages. Every Member of the Senate knows that the cost of living has increased more than 50 percent since 1927. Consider the item of underwear. Garments that used to cost 50 cents now cost \$1.50. Consider the item of food; consider butter—when we can get it. There have been great increases in cost all along the line. Senators should consider those matters when they are called upon to vote for the conference report, which provides for increases in the lowest brackets of 50 percent over 1927 wages. They should consider the report made by the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, and they should also consider the report by J. Edgar Hoover regarding the terrible conditions which exist in the city of Washington and in other places.

Mr. President, as I have said, I have very high regard for the judgment of my colleagues. But I simply cannot understand how they can vote for the payment of a salary of \$1,080, for instance, to a Federal worker. Thousands of Government workers are receiving salaries of only \$1,070 a year. Thousands are being paid only \$2,258 a year. Thousands of them are being paid \$1,330 a year. Thousand are being paid \$1,240 a year.

In view of the fact that the conferees on the part of the House originally recommended the provisions of the House bill calling for an increase of \$400 a year, I call attention to the fact that under the conference report in some of the higher brackets the increases are to be, not \$400 a year, but as much as \$989.80. I have no fault to find with that, insofar as the workers in the upper brackets are concerned. I understand that some of the Federal workers who receive the higher salaries serve in very important positions.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I know that the Senator from North Dakota would not wish to make a misstatement of fact. I understood the Senator to say that after the conference report is adopted and the bill goes into effect, 90 percent of the Federal workers will receive less than \$1,700 a year.

Mr. LANGER. I said that one-third of them would.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is not correct. The bill applies to only 962,000 Federal workers, I believe. Of these 962,000, it is

true that approximately two-thirds will receive less than \$2,600, and one-third of them will receive more than \$2,600.

Mr. LANGER. Will the distinguished Senator from California tell me how many of them are to receive less than \$1,785.71?

Mr. DOWNEY. I should have to have some latitude in making a guess about that.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that about 29 percent of them will?

Mr. DOWNEY. Approximately 29 percent will. But let me say that the Senator should call to the attention of the Senate the fact that that number includes part-time workers and elevator boys, messengers, and workers in other categories, perhaps including waiters in the Senate restaurant who may work for only 4 or 5 hours.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from California does not claim that all the Federal workers included in the 29 percent—nearly one-third of the total—are elevator boys and messengers.

Mr. DOWNEY. I think quite a number of them are engaged in part-time work or work of that character in the Federal service.

Of course, Mr. President, I think all of us wish to increase the salaries of the Federal workers. But let me say that I believe this measure places the average employee of the Federal Government at least in a much better position than that of the average worker in private employment. I agree with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that it is with the utmost difficulty that any family can live on \$175 or \$200 a month. But, unfortunately, that is about the average income, and that is about all that our production at the present time justifies.

I think all of us want to have the country get back to work, produce more goods, be able to raise wages, especially those in the lower-paid groups. But I think the Senator from North Dakota inadvertently made a misstatement of fact.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say that some of the women operating elevators are married and support children. Under this measure some of them will be paid \$1,080 a year. In some instances messengers are the heads of families. Not all of them are young children. They will receive \$1,080 or \$1,170 or \$1,258, or some such amount.

I wish to make it very plain that I have no particular objection to the proposed increases in salaries for some of the workers in the higher brackets, in view of the increased cost of living, but I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that since 1927 the increases in pay for poor people who work for the Federal Government will have amounted to 50 percent. I know that every Senator realizes that in some instances the cost of clothing has increased 200 or 300 percent. I protest against having the Federal workers in the lower brackets receive such small salaries.

I also call the attention of the Senate to a speech made by the distinguished Senator from California who is chairman of the committee. When the pay

bill was under consideration, he pleaded, day after day, with tears in his eyes, for the very people in whose behalf I am now speaking.

I realize the difficulty. I realize that some members of the conference committee were not in favor of very much of an increase. I know what a great heart the distinguished chairman of the committee has. I have seen him plead upon this floor, with tears in his eyes, asking that the Senate provide more pay for the people in the lower categories. I agree with everything he said when, speaking upon this floor some months ago, he stated that the Federal workers in the lower brackets are not being paid enough.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator from North Dakota might make a strong argument to the effect that a messenger boy should not have been paid \$750 a year prior to last July. But that boy would have his income raised 50 percent, according to the terms of the pending measure. In other words, in the course of a year we shall have raised by 50 percent the compensation of the workers in the lower brackets. Certainly the Senator cannot complain about that.

Mr. LANGER. What is the amount of the increase over 1927 salaries?

Mr. DOWNEY. In the Federal employment there was no increase in salary from 1927 to 1945.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, the messenger boy, or messenger man, or woman who may receive an injury on the elevator, for example, is to receive a 50-percent raise.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Senator can express the situation however he wishes. This bill increases the compensation of employees in the lower brackets by 50 percent, which I think is away above the national average rate of compensation for the kind of work which they perform.

Mr. President, we are dealing with a practical situation. Since the beginning of inflation, we have raised the compensation of persons in the lower brackets by 50 percent. Such increase represents more than persons in comparable private industries have been allowed. I shall be happy at some other time to go along with the Senator in an effort to secure higher wages for all Federal workers. But certainly, in my judgment, there can be no serious complaint against awarding a 50-percent increase in the lower brackets.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I shall vote for the conference report; I do not want any misunderstanding to occur about that; but under it employees in the lower brackets will receive an increase of \$250 a year. I want every Senator to know, that, in my opinion, that increase is not sufficient. The other House, itself, said that the increase should be \$400. I should be willing to make it apply on up to the \$10,000 limit.

Mr. DOWNEY. The House adopted a provision for a \$400 flat increase for all Government employees which, of course, provided only a 5-percent increase for the man in the \$8,000 brackets. That

provision seemed to do an injustice to many employees. The House bill would have caused almost insuperable difficulty. If there had been a \$400 flat increase it would have placed many employees in the lower brackets almost in line with each other, when taken in conjunction with the prior bill which had been passed. Therefore, although an employee may have been employed in Government service as a stenographer for 2 or 3 years, he would receive almost no more money than would the person who entered Government service only recently. The \$400 flat increase would tend to crowd up the persons in the lower brackets into almost the same category. Unfortunately, we have accomplished the same result in the upper brackets. By imposing a ceiling of \$10,000 on salaries, we have crowded many of the employees in the administrative groups up to the top level, so that, in some cases, heads of bureaus will receive no more than some of the subordinates under them. I admit that such unfortunate conditions exist, but we all thought that it was better to take care of the situation in this manner than to crowd the increases into the lower brackets.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may ask a question of the Senator from California?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the conference report, what would be the salary of a CAF-1 person?

Mr. DOWNEY. It would be \$1,690.

Mr. AIKEN. That would include the \$260 raise?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; the salary was \$1,200 on June 30, 1945. It would now be increased by \$490.

Mr. AIKEN. CAF-1 represents the rating of the average girl who comes to Washington from out of town to take a position with the Government as a typist or a junior stenographer, does it not?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes. It represents the lowest grade of work which is performed in Government service.

Mr. AIKEN. Has there been any change in the rate of promotion?

Mr. DOWNEY. No. We reduce the time when within-grade promotions may be made from 13 and 18 months to 12 months and 18 months.

Mr. AIKEN. Then there may be an upgrading at the end of 12 months.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to discuss for a moment my own personal philosophy with reference to the \$10,000 group which was mentioned a moment ago by the Senator from California.

It is true that under the philosophy of the pending proposal there is a crowding at the top bracket of \$10,000. Personally I have the feeling that at some time in the future the \$10,000 ceiling will have to be broken at appropriate places. I am not willing to advocate the breaking of the ceiling until we can examine it carefully and ascertain where, under what conditions, and in what departments and categories the ceiling should be broken. Even at the expense of crowding at the present time, without more adequate and

proper information I would rather not see the ceiling broken. I believe that the time has come when we should make a reexamination of the equitable pay scales in the various categories of Government employees. We have approached the matter on prior occasions by piecemeal. Certainly inequities have occurred. But I believe that the present approach to an increase in compensation, when coupled with the increase which was granted a year ago, not only does substantial equity and justice to the persons in the lower brackets who received a large percentage increase a year ago, but it also recognizes that those in the higher brackets of Government are entitled to some degree of consideration. As the Senator from California pointed out a moment ago, even when taking into consideration the combined increases, the employees are still not receiving increases which are commensurate with the admitted minimum increase which has taken place in the cost of living.

I think the Senator from North Dakota was absolutely correct in saying that the actual cost of living in this country is far below what the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the OPA state it to be. But so far as the record is concerned, the proposal would mean approximately a 33-percent increase over all.

I personally believe, Mr. President, that this proposal, when coupled with the increases which were provided in the bill last year, will really do substantial equity and justice to the low-bracket employees, and at the same time will give a modest measure of recognition to the higher-bracket employees.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in conclusion I can only say that the 1945 increase in compensation was 20 percent. That was the first increase these employees had received since 1927. It was totally inadequate to meet their requirements. They were not able to get along on it. I know of families which are undernourished. I believe that nearly every other Member of the Senate knows of similar families. We are now asking 29 percent of, roughly, 200,000 families to live on less money than our Department of Labor has said is necessary in order that a person may live decently.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think the Senator should make clear his statement with reference to some of these lower brackets. Before the new rate went into effect an employee who worked part time received a yearly compensation of \$720. A full-time employee began at the rate of \$1,704.

Mr. LANGER. My figures show \$1,690.

Mr. BYRD. For full time?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Before the pay raise went into effect on July 19, 1945, the salary was \$1,440. It is now \$1,704, and is to be increased to \$1,954, or by about 34 percent.

Mr. LANGER. I am referring to the \$1,200 salary. The figures are not for part time, but for full time.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is referring to employees who received \$1,200 before July 19, 1945. They are now receiving \$1,440.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; and they have been raised to \$1,690.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. The Department of Labor says that, in order to live decently, those persons should receive \$1,920.

Mr. BYRD. Many of those employees are not living in localities throughout the country where the higher cost of living exists. They are scattered throughout the country in localities where the cost of living is comparatively low.

Mr. LANGER. I am speaking according to the figures given to me by our own Department of Labor.

Mr. BYRD. I understand; but, as the Senator knows, living costs vary in different sections of the country. I admit that the cost is high in Washington and New York, but these employees are scattered around everywhere. Only 10 percent of them are in the city of Washington.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to the Senator that the report of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor shows that, no matter where they are living, in America a single girl should have an income of \$1,920 a year in order to live decently. It does not refer only to the city of Washington.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator will admit, however, that there have been considerable increases made within the last year, starting with 50 percent in the case of \$720 part-time employees.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota who asserts it takes \$1,920 a year for a single person to live decently, that I think the average pay of the school teachers throughout the United States, with the possible exception of some of the large metropolitan centers, is in the neighborhood of a thousand dollars a year. I do not defend that low pay. I have for many years, in my home State, and elsewhere, tried to get the pay of school teachers raised, but I submit that school teachers live probably in modest comfort, though not as affluently as I would have them, if I were permitted to fix the pay scales. I still do not agree that it is absolutely essential throughout the United States, in every hamlet and community, that a single person receive \$1,920 a year. I think that is more than the cost of living; in fact, in the average smaller, modest community in the United States it is not enough to permit a person to live in affluence, perhaps, but in my State I do not believe the average person in the smaller community, clerks and others, even demand \$1,920 a year for a single person. Certainly, I should like to have all the income I could earn if I were in business, or again practicing law. Probably there is no limit to what I would like to have, and I probably could spend all the money I could get.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to have the Senator give us the name of a city where a teacher gets a thousand dollars a year at the present time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am sorry I cannot give the Senator the exact statistics at the moment, but I shall try to look them up. In what we might call metropolitan schools, that is, the Washington schools, the New York schools, the Chicago schools, and the like, those in the large cities, there is a higher level of

pay, which runs around seventeen or eighteen hundred dollars, but when we get away from the metropolitan area I doubt that the average school teacher, in the common grade schools in the small town, and the small town high schools throughout the United States receives more than a thousand dollars.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that no one fought harder for increased compensation for teachers than I did when we were considering a Senate bill on that subject about a year and a half ago. The salaries of teachers have increased all over the country, including the State of Iowa, which the distinguished Senator represents in the Senate, and if he will take the trouble to look up the statistics, he will find that the pay of a teacher in Iowa today is around \$150 a month.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator may be correct, because I have not seen the figures recently and I shall not dispute him, because he feels he has sufficient information to enable him to speak on the subject, but I shall take the trouble to look the matter up in the next few days. I have been in the teachers' pay fight; I have been in the teachers' annuity fight; I was somewhat instrumental in advancing the cause when I was a member of the Iowa Legislature, and I have been somewhat in touch with it. I believe the Senator is wrong about the matter.

Mr. LANGER. Let me suggest that when the Senator was in the legislature it was before we had the war. The Senator has been Governor two or three times, and has been in the Senate for some time. I agree that before the war teachers were woefully underpaid and they still are.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I could tell the Senator what the average pay of the teachers in Iowa was before the war.

Mr. LANGER. I can tell the Senator that during the drought it was a disgrace—\$65 or \$70 a month.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Not during the drought, but in 1938 and 1939, when prosperity had returned. The average pay of teachers in the State of Iowa—which, let me remind the Senator, has been for many years and still is the most literate State in the Union—

Mr. LANGER. Except North Dakota.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The average pay of the teachers in that State, after a certain raise went into effect, was still only about \$785 a year.

Mr. LANGER. For 9 months.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is, their yearly income. That included the pay in the large towns, where the salary would run up to \$2,400 and \$3,000 a year in many instances. I was stating the average.

I am talking of the average for the teachers in the common schools, leaving out the metropolitan areas. It will be interesting to me to obtain the information, to see whether the Senator from North Dakota is correct when he says \$1,800 was the scale, or whether I am right in stating it was around \$1,000.

Mr. LANGER. I am sure the Senator will find, when he investigates, that since the war came on the pay has increased to around \$150 a month. The country

schools in North Dakota are now paying considerably more than they formerly paid. They had to do so in order to get the teachers. What the Senator said was true as to the time during the drought.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I beg the Senator's pardon. What I said was not applied to the time of the drought. What I said was true of the time after the drought was over, and after the country began to be productive again, in 1937 and 1938.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I believe teachers' salaries at the present time are entirely inadequate, and I am in favor of the enactment of Senate bill 181, which was introduced, I believe, by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD].

Mr. AIKEN. No, the bill was introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the former Senator from Ohio, Mr. Burton, who is now on the Supreme Court. The Senator from New York and the Senator from Vermont did introduce a bill which embraced some features which we thought could well be incorporated in whatever Federal-aid education bill Congress should eventually pass, as we hope some bill will be passed. I hope that action on the Federal aid to education legislation may be taken up at an early date.

Mr. LANGER. I want the RECORD to show that I am supporting the Aiken-Mead bill as introduced and that I will support any bill which will very substantially raise teachers' salaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MEDIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4908) to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in the warfare which is on between industry and union labor at the present time we find most of the newspapers of the country taking the part of industry and most of the editorials presenting the industrial side of the picture.

Once in a while, however, there is an editor who has courage enough to intimate, in speaking of the coal strike, that the coal miners have some rights, and that the conditions under which they work are such as to build up powerful union leaders such as John L. Lewis.

One of these editors is Mr. Robert Mitchell, editor of the Rutland Herald, published in Rutland, Vt., and I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from that newspaper entitled "Coal Mine Working Conditions," which appeared on May 15, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAL MINE WORKING CONDITIONS

A great deal of public indignation has been stimulated by John L. Lewis as a result of the coal strike, which has tended to obscure rather than shed light on conditions among the miners in Kentucky and Tennessee.

While Lewis knows how to get what he wants, his methods have done little to enlist public sympathy for the plight of the coal miner, as Marquis Childs indicates in his column today.

Despite the tremendous power of the United Mine Workers leader, that power has been surprisingly ineffective in improving working conditions and the economic status of the miners in certain areas, particularly in Kentucky and Tennessee. While Lewis looms as a tower of strength on the national scene and the mine operators seem puny by comparison, it is the operators who have things their own way in the Kentucky-Tennessee mining area.

Writing in the Washington Post, Agnes E. Meyer, wife of the Post publisher, recently compared the coal mines of Kentucky to the battle beaches of Iwo Jima. From 145 to 180 miners are killed in Kentucky every year, and in 1944 there were 10,000 of the 67,000 miners injured in industrial accidents. The inadequacy of the compensation laws of Kentucky has provided Lewis with his best argument for a \$70,000,000 health and welfare fund.

Twenty miners were buried alive in the Christmas disaster at the Fourmile mine in Kentucky last year. Five other men involved in the accident survived, and although none of them will be able to work as miners again, neither they nor the families of the dead victims of the accident have received any compensation from the mine owner. It was found that there was no compensation in force at the time of the accident. Provisions of the Vermont Workmen's Compensation Act are not considered liberal, but it is difficult for Vermonters to conceive of a law that would permit lack of any kind of coverage at all.

The first problem in the Kentucky coal mines remains what it has always been—forcing the operators to undertake adequate safety measures. There is also the responsibility for insuring proper compensation for those who are injured and their families.

Despite the higher wages paid during the last 6 or 7 years, Mrs. Meyer asserts that there has been no improvement in the standard of living of the Kentucky miners, who continue to live in filth and squalor, ignorant of wise money handling and indifferent to better living and health conditions. Victimized by the mine operators for years, these workers are easy prey for any manipulations which John Lewis wishes to make in his game of power politics.

The Wagner Act, in its one-sided protection of labor unions, gives great power to a union boss and leaves management at a disadvantage in bargaining with him, but John Lewis would never have obtained dictatorial power over the United Mine Workers without aid from the mine operators. The operators, exercising their power over State governments, have kept the mine workers in primitive servitude so long that the miners have no compunctions about being the slaves of Lewis.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in the gallery at present is a group of men who are not only servicemen, but are servicemen who have given their limbs for our country in the war. They have brought here a petition signed by a group of veterans. The petition covers almost the two pages, and reads:

We, the undersigned patients at the Thomas England General Hospital, Atlantic City, N. J., and Walter Reed Hospital, in Washington, D. C., have served in various theaters of the recent war; we have sustained injuries which most of us will carry for life. We voice no resentment. We are proud to have served our country. In our efforts to win the treatment we are entitled to we have had the support of organized labor. We now

voice our support of organized labor and other groups which are opposing repressive labor legislation now pending in Congress.

Mr. President, on those two petitions are signatures of men from almost all the States of the Union—New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Alabama, New Jersey, Iowa, Connecticut, North Carolina, Texas, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Montana, and other States in the Union. The veterans who signed these two petitions have presented them to us so that they might be used for this purpose, understanding, as they do, the issues involved in the controversy now pending on the Senate floor, and I say that it is worthy of note by Members of the Senate that the men who made almost the supreme sacrifice for their country feel that there is involved the civil rights of citizens of this country; they feel that there is under attack the right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively by the series of amendments that are pending to the committee bill. They feel that organized labor is deserving of the support and the confidence of the veterans who fought for this country and that now we should not turn against them to deprive them of the gain they won in the many long years they fought for bettering the conditions of themselves and their families.

Mr. President, I want to add only this: I am informed that the President of the United States this afternoon has taken over the railroads. It is my earnest hope, and I repeat essentially what I said here yesterday, that the President will exercise the authority which I believe him to possess under the Smith-Connally Act, and that now, as the operator of the American railroads which he has taken over, he will, through his chosen representatives, negotiate with the employees, and by true collective bargaining, guided only by the principles of right and the public interest, with due regard for the private interest of the management and the ownership, enter into agreements which will make it possible for the working men and women who are today involved in this controversy to get their due, and for the United States public to enjoy the continued service of the great railroad system of this country. I hope that the President of the United States will set that precedent now, and then, as soon as he has acted in the railroad case, follow the same precedent in the coal mine case. I believe that if the President will do that in less than 10 days not only will the railroad strike be settled, not only will the so-called coal strike be settled, but we will have made a momentous step forward in having worked out a procedure whereby in cases of crisis a way will be opened by which these controversies can be thoroughly settled.

If the President has any doubt at all about his authority to do that, I am sure he will find a responsive Senate and House that will add any clarity he may feel is necessary to his authority. But I feel that he has it. I feel that the Congress will back him up if he exercises it; I am confident that the country will give him its support if he exercises it; and I believe that the employees of the rail-

roads and the employees of the coal mines will support him if given an opportunity to sit down in a true spirit of collective bargaining to work out their differences with such a fair representative of management as the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the petition from this distinguished and beloved group of veterans whom I referred to, in the gallery, may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned patients at the Thomas England General Hospital, Atlantic City, N. J., and Walter Reed Hospital in Washington, D. C., have served in various theaters of the recent war; we have sustained injuries which most of us will carry for life. We voice no resentment. We are proud to have served our country. In our efforts to win the treatment we are entitled to we have had the support of organized labor. We now voice our support of organized labor and other groups which are opposing repressive labor legislation now pending in Congress.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I was very much interested in the comment just made by the Senator from Florida on what he believed would be a happy solution of the difficulties of the railroads. I certainly am glad, and I think all Members of the Senate are glad, that the President has acted expeditiously to take over the railroads to avert a stoppage of operation. But, as I understood the Senator from Florida, he indicated that it was his belief that the President should now proceed to negotiate a final and binding agreement with the employees of the railroads on behalf of the employers, and that that would represent true collective bargaining as he interpreted it.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the situation in which the head of an administration which is openly allied politically with the CIO-PAC would negotiate a collective-bargaining contract on behalf of the employer with his employees to me presents a rather fantastic interpretation of what I believe free collective bargaining between management and its employees means under the law.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am not the defender of the President; but I wish to say that the President is the President of the United States. He is not representing the CIO and the PAC any more than he is representing the Baptist Church or the fraternal organizations with which he may happen to be associated. He is not representing one segment of the American people any more than another. I am sure that upon reflection the able and distinguished Senator from Minnesota would not wish to inspire a public lack of confidence in the people's Chief Magistrate by suggesting that his official Executive acts are colored either by partisanship or by prejudice in behalf of one particular segment of the political or economic life of this country.

I have faith that if the President of the United States acts he will act in a way which is right and fair, and

that he will not be blinded by prejudice or selfish pecuniary interests. I know that the President believes that the working people of this country—indeed, all the people—should have health protection, because he recommended to this Congress that we enact health legislation. If the miners had had the kind of health legislation which the President recommended, Mr. John L. Lewis would not have been able to use the club of delinquency which he has been able to raise against the operators of the coal mines in providing for the employees he represents.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I do not wish to engage in a debate with the Senator from Florida as to the character of President Truman. In my service with him here I learned to respect and admire him, and I have great affection for him. I think that on the record a very good case could be made for the proposition which I stated that this administration has shown considerable bias on the side of great organizations of labor. But I think it is clear from the remarks of the Senator from Florida that he seems to feel that the leaders of unions in their collective-bargaining negotiations are always virtuous, and never have selfish motives, but that the employers, on the other hand, are always blackguards, always motivated solely by greedy self-interest. That does not quite jibe with my observation of human nature.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I believe that if the able Senator from Minnesota were acting in the way he is so capable of acting after reflection and deliberation he would not have made that charge against the Senator from Florida any more than he would have indulged in the previous innuendo against the President of the United States.

I have never stated that management was all bad and labor was all good. Most of us have about as much humanity in us as the rest of us; and that applies to labor unions. However, I did say—and I repeat—that if the Government of the United States, under the direction of its President, were negotiating these agreements, the President would be able to look at the problem from the viewpoint of fairness, and dispassionately, in the public interest, regardless of the private and pecuniary motive which sometimes clouds the vision, or the prejudice which sometimes limits the ability to see of the man who has that kind of an interest. The suggestion which I made seemed to me to offer a practical way by which progress could be made in the solution of this controversy, in the service of the public interest.

EXTENSION OF FARM BANKRUPTCY ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 5504, known as the act to extend the Frazier-Lemke Farm Bankruptcy Act. Let me say, by way of explanation, that when the bill passed the House it provided for extending the Farm Bankruptcy Act, known as the Frazier-Lemke Act, for a period of 15 months. The Senate Committee on the Judiciary

saw fit to reduce it to 1 month. The conferees adopted a compromise which extended it to March 31, 1947.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is the conference report signed by all the Senate conferees?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. There is no disagreement among the Senate conferees?

Mr. McCARRAN. There is no disagreement among the Senate conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report submitted by the Senator from Nevada will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5504) to amend an Act entitled "An Act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Instead of "June 4, 1946" as proposed by the Senate insert "March 31, 1947"; and the Senate agree to the same.

PAT McCARRAN,
ABS MURDOCK,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
SAM HOBBS,
EARL C. MICHENER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the conference report was considered and agreed to.

GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I take this opportunity to say a few words on a measure pending on the Senate Calendar, namely, House Joint Resolution 304? This joint resolution is very close to the hearts of many of my Massachusetts constituents. It has been passed by the House, and I am confident it will be passed by the Senate as soon as the calendar is called. As I shall not then have an opportunity to say anything about the subject I should like to speak on it very briefly now.

This joint resolution authorizes the President to proclaim October 11, 1946, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

In Massachusetts, since 1932, our General Court has required the Governor annually to issue a proclamation upon this day. For 6 years I eagerly issued such proclamations. I am heartily in favor of this resolution and hope it may be adopted.

Count Casimir Pulaski was born in one of the blackest periods of Poland's tragic subjugation, when his compatriots—as during World War II—were crushed by a cruel conspiracy against the rights of man. He lived in a period when the Colonies in America were throwing off the yoke of tyranny of King George III. After fighting for freedom in his land of Poland, only to see it go down to defeat, Count Pulaski escaped the clutch of the conqueror and continued from afar to do what he could for the land he loved. Later, finding no country in Europe ready to use his services, he went to Paris where he met Benjamin Franklin, the agent of the American Colonies, and arranged to come to America. George Washington accepted Pulaski's services on behalf of the American colonists, and without waiting for an officer's commission, Pulaski enlisted in the Army. Congress rewarded his bravery by commissioning him, at the instance of Washington, as the first commander of the American cavalry with the rank of brigadier general on September 15, 1777. Some 6 months later he was designated commander of the independent corps known as Pulaski's Legion. As the heroic leader of this band, he valiantly shared the fortunes of the struggling Continental Army. He repeatedly distinguished himself for his valor, military genius, and active zeal, until in the ill-fated assault upon the city of Savannah, October 9, 1779, Pulaski was wounded in the thigh by a grape shot when trying to arrest the retreat of the French columns. Two days later he died on board the United States brig *Wasp*. This loyal son of Poland, unable to save the freedom of his own land, died for that of America.

In commemorating the services of Count Pulaski in the American Revolution, we do equal homage to the services of his compatriots, who, during this last great war, suffered sorrow and abasement at the hands of a conqueror while never relenting in their supreme effort to uphold the principles of civilization. Such spirit lights the way to liberty in the world.

Mr. President, I am very glad the joint resolution has been passed by the House, and has been favorably reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and undoubtedly it will be passed by this honorable body.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Maurice T. Smith, of Colorado, to be United States marshal for the district of Colorado, vice Arthur D. Fairbanks, deceased, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward Dana Durand to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Price Gregg to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nan Wood Honeyman to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 29, with headquarters at Portland, Oreg.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles I. Lafferty to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objections, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. Under the previous order of the Senate, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate

took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 20, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 17 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Maurice T. Smith, of Colorado, to be United States marshal for the district of Colorado, vice Arthur D. Fairbanks, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 17 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Edward Dana Durand to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1952.

John Price Gregg to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1947.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Nan Wood Honeyman to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 29, headquarters at Portland, Oreg.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Charles I. Lafferty to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Henry W. Hemple to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of commander from April 1, 1946.

Edwin A. Dörner to be aide with rank of ensign from April 1, 1946.

Robert C. Darling to be aide with rank of ensign from April 16, 1946.

COAST GUARD

TO BE ENSIGNS IN THE COAST GUARD, TO RANK FROM JUNE 5, 1946

William Lamb Aitkenhead
Roy Kenneth Angell
Charles Frederick Baker
Leland Cook Batdorf
David Proyer Bates, Jr.
Charles DeLaCour Bishop
Vincent Anthony Bogucki
James William Bolding, Jr.
Richard Baker Bowden, Jr.
Charles Donald Bradburn
Jay Herbert Bramson
John Henry Bruce
George Herbert Patrick Bursley
Edward David Cassidy
Edward Egbert Chambers
William Russell Chandler
Lloyd Hubbard Clark
Malcolm Emery Clark
Albert Harley Clough
Donald Carlton Davis
Lawrence Davis, Jr.
Robert Lloyd Davis, Jr.
Roger Gilbert Devan
Robertson Pickett Dinsmore
Robert Joseph Dodge
Bruce Hamer Edwards
William Laurie Faulkenberry
Verne Doucet Finks
Charles Irving Foss 3d
Frank Hudson Fuller
Arthur Newell Garden, Jr.
James Austin Garrison
James Albert Gary 3d
Robert Stanley Gershoff
Lloyd Whitman Goddu, Jr.
Dudley Chapin Goodwin, Jr.
Walter Franklin Guy
Henry Vanderhulst Harman
John Briggs Hayes
Walter Owen Henry
James Edward Heywood

Leslie Dean High
 Ian Edward Holland
 Archibald Barwell How 2d
 Richard Bernard Humbert
 James Patrick Hynes
 David Jenkins
 Bruce Clifford Johnson
 Robert Wayne Johnson
 Frederick Steffen Kelsey
 William Joseph Kirkley
 Robert Charles Krulish
 Robert Allison Lee
 Michael Beauregard Lemly
 Rudolph Edwin Lenczyk
 Glenn Milton Loboudger
 James Hector MacDonald
 Charles Scott Marple
 Charles Madison Mayes
 Donald Joseph McCann
 Alfred Edwin McKenney, Jr.
 John Hanson Kennard Miner
 Walter Bishop Murfin
 John Egbert Van Alen Murray
 Milton Ray Neuman
 Elliott Northcott 2d
 William Merryman Page, Jr.
 Frank Eldon Parker
 Robert Donald Parkhurst
 Robert Arthur Patrick
 David Eaton Perkins
 Warren Sawyer Petterson
 William Comfort Pinder, Jr.
 Thomas William Powers
 Wilfred Francis Raes
 Dan Rayacich
 George Francis Rodgers
 Randolph Ross, Jr.
 Arthur William Rouzie
 Edward Peter Rutken
 Douglas Cargill Ryan
 George Thomas Sain, Jr.
 John Bean Saunders, Jr.
 Wilmer Schweinsberg, Jr.
 John Henry Sharp
 Herbert Henry Sharpe, Jr.
 Robert William Smith
 Charles Hudson Steele
 John Wesley Steffey
 Shirl Joseph Stephany
 James Paul Stewart
 James Howard Swint
 Alfred John Tatman
 Glenn Raymond Taylor
 David Harry Thomas
 Thomas Cartwright Thompson
 William Francis Tighe, Jr.
 Richard Morse Underwood, Jr.
 Otto Francis Unsinn
 Emil Miroslav Valehrach
 Donald Ray Vaughn
 Richard Theodore Wagner
 John Leland Wright

IN THE NAVY

The nominations of James T. Brewer et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were received by the Senate on May 13, 1946, and which appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 4916 with the name of James T. Brewer, and ending on page 4919, with the name of Edwin T. Ziolkowski.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 17, 1946

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.

And be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

Let us pray: Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy holy will that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy holy name. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 122]

Adams	Gore	Plumley
Andrews, N. Y.	Graham	Powell
Baldwin, Md.	Granger	Rains
Barden	Gwinn, N. Y.	Reece, Tenn.
Barrett, Pa.	Hall	Rich
Bell	Leonard W.	Robertson,
Bender	Harris	N. Dak.
Blackney	Hart	Robertson, Va.
Bland	Hartley	Robinson, Utah
Bonner	Hébert	Rodgers, Pa.
Boren	Heffernan	Roe, Md.
Brumbaugh	Hendricks	Roe, N. Y.
Buckley	Hinshaw	Rooney
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoch	Russell
Cannon, Fla.	Holmes, Mass.	Sabath
Carlson	Holmes, Wash.	Sadowski
Case, N. J.	Horan	Sheppard
Celler	Huber	Short
Clark	Jarman	Simpson, Pa.
Clason	Jenkins	Somers, N. Y.
Cochran	Johnson, Ind.	Siarkey
Cole, N. Y.	Judd	Stewart
Combs	Kee	Stigler
Courtney	Kelly, Ill.	Sumner, Ill.
Curley	Kinzer	Sundstrom
De Lacy	Kirwan	Taylor
DeLaney,	Knutson	Thom
James J.	Kunkel	Thomas, N. J.
D'Ewart	LaPollette	Tolan
Domengeaux	Larcade	Torrens
Eberharter	Lea	Towe
Elliott	LeCompte	Traynor
Engle, Calif.	Luce	Walter
Ervin	Lynch	Wasielewski
Forand	Mankin	Weaver
Fulton	Monroney	Welch
Gamble	Morgan	West
Gardner	Norton	White
Gavin	O'Brien, Mich.	Winter
Gearhart	Patman	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gerlach	Patrick	Wood
Gifford	Patterson	
Gillette	Pfeifer	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 302 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 624) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by House Resolution 5 of the present Congress, incurred by the standing Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$75,000, in addition to funds heretofore made available including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, our colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has been very ill for some time and I have been acting chairman of the Committee on Accounts. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Wood] and his group on un-American activities have asked the Committee on Accounts for the money provided in this resolution to continue their investigations.

They gave us some information that I just hate even to mention here about the things that are going on right here under the Capitol dome.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOYKIN. With pleasure.

Mr. TABER. I have in my hand, just to show the seriousness of this situation, a pamphlet entitled "The International Film Foundation, Inc.," announcing an initial showing of eight communistic pictures. Down at the bottom of the back page there is the statement:

All inquiries regarding any of these Government films should be addressed to Mr. Luther Evans, Librarian of Congress, Washington, D. C.

That astounds me.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman. Had the gentleman heard some of the information that was given when we had this hearing he would be even more astounded. For instance, one Member of Congress came in with a list stating that there were 70,000 Communist members in this country, had their names in active clubs, and that there were 500,000 fellow travelers, and 150,000 underground workers all working to change this form of government and to overthrow this Government.

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to say in reply to the gentleman from New York that what we should do is to clean house and fumigate, get all these un-Americans off the Federal pay roll and off the State pay rolls and off the county pay rolls, and let these boys who fought this war understand that we are going to save the Government they fought for.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that one of the appropriation bills coming up today carries an item for the Library of Congress to put the films out to the public the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] spoke of. In other words, this appropriation will go for the purpose of propaganda—Communist propaganda. We want to defeat that appropriation today. It is as necessary to do that as it is to vote this sum for the continuation of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman tell the Members how much money has been spent heretofore by the present Wood-Rankin committee as well as the Dies committee?

Mr. BOYKIN. I do not have that information here. I will be glad to get it for the gentleman. We did not go into that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I believe we ought to apply the old saying: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and keep on spending money for the purpose of keeping our country free of Communists.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. It is the only committee of the House of Representatives to which a Member can refer petitions and resolutions by groups which have high-sounding names. A week ago Saturday my home at Royal Oak, Mich., was picketed by a group that called themselves the American Veterans' Committee. I referred the matter to this committee. They report back to me that you do not even have to be a veteran to belong to that organization.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to a fact, because all the Members are concerned with it, or practically all of them. That is that these radical communistic organizations seeking to overthrow the Government are working, of course surreptitiously, getting veteran candidates into the field and running them for Congress, while the un-American agencies furnish the money and keep in the background, under cover. That is going on all over the country, as many of you men now know. The legions are for this resolution, and so am I.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. In line with what the gentleman from New York has just stated, I hold in my hand a letter written to a man and his wife in New York by a communistic group asking them to

raise \$5,000 to send down into my district to defeat me for reelection to the Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the question has been raised how much money has been spent by the Dies committee and the present committee. We are either wrong or we are right in this program. If we are right, what difference does it make how much we spend provided it is spent in a judicious and nonextravagant manner? This, I assume, is for the preservation of the Government of the United States. The money is being spent under the direction of the Members of this body. We are proposing to give practically three and three-quarter billion dollars to a certain other country in the name of national defense. I refer to the British loan. If it is right to preserve this country through the avenue of the British loan, why is it not right to preserve this country through this avenue, even if it costs a billion dollars?

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks just made by the gentleman from Michigan as to whether we are right or wrong in this matter, may I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that part of our oath as Members of Congress is to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. Does not the gentleman think that this committee is therefore an essential arm of this Congress in connection with our oath of office?

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman. I think we have some of the most outstanding men not only in Congress but the entire world on this committee.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Will the gentleman inform the House how many members there are on the so-called Wood-Rankin committee?

Mr. RANKIN. Nine.

Mr. BARRY. I want to bring out, and I think it should be brought out that there are nine members on the committee and that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has only one vote on that committee, because the mail and press reports would indicate that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] are the controlling Members of the entire committee.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. In connection with the oath of office that we as Members of the House take, I may say that the reference made to that by the gentleman from Minnesota did not put the cracker on the end of the whip. As a matter of fact, our oath of office compels

us to swear to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, both foreign and domestic.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], the ranking minority member of the committee, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we in America do not have a fool-proof, self-perpetuating system of government. We do not have here a system of government which is suitable to all peoples. We do have that system which until comparatively recently has been the ideal, the dream of the liberty-loving and liberty-longing peoples of the world. We have declared ourselves to be the asylum of the oppressed peoples of all the earth. We have in good faith and charity opened our doors to many people, but some people who have come to this country have abused the courtesies extended by attempting to destroy our Government, the sort of Government we have established, the blessing of which they have been invited to share. They are trying to establish in this country the sort of government from which they fled. They have found allies in this country. We want to know who they are and where they are, and what they are doing. The sort of government that we are trying to run—and I am not speaking racially—is the Anglo-Saxon sort of government. Our people have been trying to run this sort of government for nearly 2,000 years in these historic times. We are getting fed up with these people who are not willing to help with what we are trying to do. Many of them came from countries where for centuries and centuries the government has operated from the top downward. The people have been governed. The idea of a people governing or that a people can govern has no practical recognition in their ideology, or in their experience, or in their observation.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. The gentleman said that there were certain people from foreign countries who came over here for refuge from their country and then proceed to attempt to establish the same form of government as that which prevailed in the country from which they fled. Why should they flee from the foreign government?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This is my idea exactly: If they do not like the sort of government, why did they come here? We like it. It is not perfect. It needs a lot of things done to it. It needs most a lot of things undone to it. It is what we have had for many centuries. We have the right and the duty to defend it, and if they will not help us here I am in favor of helping them to flee back where they came from. We have committed ourselves to one sort of government. That does not mean that our sort of government is the best government for every people. To say that a people who have been governed by a king or

held for centuries in a totalitarian government can operate as a democracy by ratifying the contents of a document purporting to be the constitution of a democracy is absurd. The road by which nations of people can reach fitness for free government is a long one. Many people have borrowed our Constitution, but none of the borrowers have been able to operate a government under it because it was to them only a document. It was not rooted in their governmental concepts. It was not fixed in their governmental instincts. I admit that there is much for us to do to bring our policy into harmony with our Constitution, but our route is not back toward a system of man government. The centuries of successful resistance to the natural downhill tendency in that direction has strengthened our people and fitted them for the duties of self-government.

This criticizing the Russian system of government for the Russian people and insisting on the superiority of our system for them is not merely silly, but hurtful and dangerous to the peace of the world. It is very foolish for us to imagine that the Russian people, recently released from serfdom and doubtless making progress toward self-government, can now operate the sort of government that we have been centuries learning how to operate, building up capacity to operate. Their sort of government is probably the best sort of government for them, but that does not mean it is the best sort for the majority of the people of this country. How long do you think people who believe in the Anglo-Saxon sort of government would last in Russia now if they were doing in Russia what the people who believe in the Russian philosophy of government are doing in this country today? They are doing a lot of it under cover. The thing which we of the world have got to do, if we want to get along, is to let the other people operate the sort of government that they believe in and are capable of operating. That goes for us as well as for the other fellow. Let experience and demonstration of merit settle arguments among friendly rivals.

We believe in a government by the people. We believe in the sort of government that we have been operating for centuries and centuries. I do not believe in propagandizing other peoples or trying to force other peoples. The way to spread democracy is to demonstrate its vitality, its superiority, as the sort of government under which people can have liberty, opportunity, and happiness, where the individual citizenship speaks the voice of government. While we have been running all over the world strutting our stuff as the champions of democracy in the world, we have been making leagues of political expediency with organized groups who are the declared enemies of our democracy. But those words in the Songs of Solomon, "They made me the keeper of the vineyards but mine own vineyard have I not kept," challenge us to an examination of the degree of our vigilance. It is time we were doing some work in our own vineyard, ease up a bit in telling everybody else what to do as to their government, and see to it that we do our own job bet-

ter, and one of our jobs is to discover what is going on in this country. If democracy survives in the world, it must demonstrate again its superiority as well as its ability to defend itself against its enemies, foreign and domestic. It is my judgment we should be careful in our expressions. It is not a question as to what sort of government is best for all peoples. It is a matter of allowing each people to work out their own problems, advising them if they want our advice, and in any way we can, giving them the benefit of our long experience in self-government if they want it. But we do not want to be interfered with either by any subversive gangs or movements. We know they are operating in our country. We want to know who they are, what they are doing. That is what this appropriation is for.

I yield at this point for any question that any of you Members want to ask me.

Mr. GEELAN. I would like to have the gentleman define what is an Anglo-Saxon form of government.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The basic philosophy of the Anglo-Saxon form of government is this: It is an association of private people engaged in a common enterprise of governing themselves. It is diametrically opposed to a totalitarian government, a government which operates from the top downward. Great groups of controlled voters do not fit into its philosophy either.

Mr. GEELAN. I would like to know if the Anglo-Saxon form of government was in existence in England prior to the establishment of Parliament.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; it was brought there in the fifth and sixth centuries from Germany by the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes. In the local government of the cities and boroughs and shires it functioned with the rudiments of a national constitution which limited the power of the King and his lords who constituted the central government.

Mr. GEELAN. Does the gentleman call that a democratic government?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Never mind about what I call it. I have answered the gentleman's question. The first picture we get of our system of government is given to us by Tacitus who wrote in the first century. He gives us a picture of our Germanic political ancestors. When a matter of government was to be attended to the tribe was assembled. They were called to order. They sat down armed. A leader submitted the matter for their consideration. If the people of the tribe approved, they brandished their weapons; if they disapproved they murmured. There we see the place of the leader and the place of the people with the people speaking the voice of government. Tacitus also says that the leaders were influential as they had the power to persuade as distinguished from the power to command. Of course, the road of democratic progress has not been smooth. There have been many struggles, many retrogressions, and many victories. The whole history of democratic progress has been away from centralized power and totalitarianism, the direction in which these subversive elements would move us. This is not the first time that democracy has been called upon to de-

fend itself against its enemies and it will not be the last time. A great student once said that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. There was never a truer saying. If danger cannot attack from without it attacks from within. This proposed appropriation is an indication that those who believe in our sort of government are not entirely unvigilant.

In our form of government it is the people who govern, at least we have a governmental set-up which makes that sort of government possible. By its nature, it operates from the people upward. They have the power to shape its policy. They have the power and speak the voice of government. That is not true in a totalitarian system of government. A totalitarian government operates from the top down, and that is the sort of thing that many people seem to be busy trying to establish in this country, a government dominant, a people regimented, controlled, dependent.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Committees of Congress are supposed to make recommendations which will be implemented by legislation. Can the gentleman point out a single bill that has been passed by this House as the result of the recommendation of either the Dies committee or the Wood-Rankin committee?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not want to go into that detail now. What we propose to do is to have some committee of this House, vigilant and on the firing line, and watching what these people are doing in this country, and disclosing their discoveries to the people of this democracy, who are its government. There is no excuse for anybody pretending not to know what is being attempted in America. It may be you agree that what they are doing is right, but you cannot, I believe, in good conscience say you do not know in a general way what is going on, much of it under cover.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is fair. Does he not believe this committee should investigate all un-American and subversive activities, whether they are on the part of so-called Communists or Fascists or any others, that tend to destroy the unity of this country?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I agree with that.

I go further. I believe we make a mistake in criticizing the government they are operating in Russia as though it were a mean and bad system, basically. It may be the best system for those people. But is it not the sort of government we are trying to operate in this country. That constitutes no basis for quarrel or enmity. For centuries we have been

committed to a different sort of government. The obligation to be tolerant and to concede freedom of choice and action, does not extend to an organized effort to destroy our Constitution by those who shelter themselves under its protection while engaged in the work of its attempted destruction.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that the people to whom the gentleman refers have proven themselves in the last war, and in the war before, to be patriotic and devoted to our flag?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. A lot of them began to demonstrate their patriotism after Russia got on our side. When Russia was on the other side, it was quite different. But I do not want to get into a row with Russia. I think the Russian people have the sort of government, probably, that is best for them. Let us not try to impose our ideology on them. I believe ours is best, of course, but leave to them freedom of choice as to the direction in which they move. Let us run our Government and let other people run theirs. If that is done, we can be good neighbors in a world of peace.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I hold in my hand a photograph from the United Press, The Fires of Hatred Blaze Again; Revival of the Ku Klux Klan. Can the gentleman tell us how much of this money this committee will use for the investigation of this organization?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; I cannot tell you how much they will use for the Ku Klux Klan. I cannot tell you what they will use anywhere. I am not in favor of the Ku Klux Klan, and I am not in favor of a lot of other clans we have in this country.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I think most of the Members of this House know that I served on the Dies committee the first 6 years it was organized. I need not recall to the Members of this House the ridicule, the abuse, the obstacles, and the handicaps that were heaped upon that committee during those years. I am proud of the service I rendered on that committee. I considered it a very high privilege and a responsibility to serve on that committee. I resigned from the committee about 2 years ago, largely because of ill health, and not because I was not in full sympathy with the work of that committee.

After a careful analysis, a considered analysis of the work that was accomplished by that first Un-American Activities Committee, usually called the Dies committee, I call the attention of the House to the fact that that committee did two things, one of which was to awaken this Nation to the menace that was within its own borders. I think that committee made the American people conscious at least of that menace. That came as a result of the publicity that was given to the activities and the hearings of that committee. The second thing the committee did, in my opinion,

was much more valuable than to awaken this Nation to the menace that existed. During these years these subversive-activity groups were not underground—they were above ground. Their records were available, and the Dies committee did subpoena and seize records of many of these organizations. As a result of that, they compiled a card system of un-American activities and of people engaged in un-American activities of more than 1,000,000 separate indexed cards. Since Pearl Harbor, the FBI, the Secret Intelligence, the Naval Intelligence, and the Army Intelligence, have had representatives combing those files daily for evidence concerning these things and have taken out from those files the information they needed and have gone out and arrested hundreds of people and put them behind bars, which the FBI could not have done if the Dies committee had not compiled those statistics when they were available. That, to me, is the most important thing that the Dies committee did. That was worth more than all the money paid for the operations of the Dies committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It should be obvious to all that the great majority are opposed to any foreign country coming over here and teaching their doctrines, either by radio, by libraries, or periodicals, but still there is a bill now before the Congress, reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which would have us go throughout the world into these foreign countries teaching our doctrines by radio, press, and through the libraries. I would like to have the gentleman tell me what he thinks about the United States refusing to let them come over here and teaching their doctrines and still we want to go over there to teach our doctrine.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes more to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. I will answer that in this way: I am absolutely opposed to forcing our form of government or our ideals and principles upon any nation in any way through this propaganda machine that the State Department wants to set up. I was so opposed to it that I opposed the appropriation on the floor and went on the radio and opposed it also.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Could anyone be consistent and say that we should go throughout the world teaching our doctrines, but that we want them to stop coming here and teaching their isms in this country?

Mr. MASON. I cannot see how you can be consistent when you object to their propagandizing us if we are going to propagandize them.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. In fairness to the State Department, what the Government is trying to do with reference to what you

call propaganda of the United States is to send the information regarding our form of government abroad. The only thing we are trying to do is to give the information abroad of our form of government and try in some way to dispel the lies they have been sending over here.

Mr. MASON. I refuse to yield any further because I claim that that is not the purpose the State Department has, and I claim that that can be done through regular, legitimate news agencies as it has been done in the past. It is not necessary for the State Department to enter into that propagandizing business.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] and the Members that this is not propaganda, and the news cannot be gotten out through the press agencies.

Only last Tuesday we had before the Committee on Foreign Affairs several of the most important editors of this country. They explained that that is not the way to inform the people of the world regarding our form of government. It cannot be done through the news, because they will not take it that way. The news only sends out certain things that the editors want to print. The editors are the ones who are to decide what they print in their papers.

Now, you are talking about protecting your Government. Let us try to protect it and be honest and fair about it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Texas, I too have a great affection and respect for the Government of the United States and its institutions. Because of that respect, I do not wish to see it made possible for a government by inquisition to be either created, or continued. I cannot see any group, including a committee of this House setting itself up as a grand jury, district attorney, and judge. I do not wish to see any committee of this House acting without guaranteeing adequate freedom of expression to those who are accused. I do not desire that there be any committee in this House that will besmirch the names of citizens of this country who are then denied the right of ample opportunity to prove their innocence.

I believe that this House, which is the highest law-making body in the country should be first to respect the fundamental rights guaranteed individuals by the Constitution. Our committees have a duty and an obligation not only to the House itself, but to the people of the country to respect American institutions. The right of a fair hearing, the right to face one's accuser, the right to offer proof and to issue denials are fundamentally American, and are rights which must be retained.

The primary question this afternoon is whether or not this committee has re-

ceived ample funds and whether it now has a balance of sufficient size to continue operation. I believe the committee has more than ample funds. Let the committee come before the House and show positive results from the money expended and not make mere accusations without proof. Let them prove the guilt of those whom they accuse. It is not American to besmirch or call names without proof. It is not fair and just to any human being that they be branded Communists and Fascists by a committee of this House and then nothing more be done about it.

Today will be a field day for fanaticism. Let us try to keep out of our debate fanatical statements. The purpose of this resolution is to provide more funds for the Un-American Activities Committee. Let us stick to that discussion without fanatical outbursts. If we stick to the issues and hear the results that this committee has achieved, I am sure that the House will agree with me that no further funds should be provided.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to this resolution is well known. I voted against similar resolutions to give funds to the Dies committee, the predecessor of this committee, as well as to the continuation of that committee.

I would like to make this plain. I have only 1 minute. We recently in this House demonstrated our confidence and admiration for Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the FBI, by unanimously agreeing to raise his salary. That organization is the finest organization in the world for any type of investigation, including subversive activities, or any other thing. It seems to me, instead of setting a precedent by giving additional money to a standing committee of this House we should let the FBI do this job. Everybody has confidence in that organization, everybody knows they will do a good job, and that is a good deal more than can be said about this committee. Let the FBI do it, and then the people of the country will be satisfied that the job is well done.

The committee has permitted itself to become a forum for the dissemination of racial and religious theories which are no part of our democratic form of government. It has demonstrated its bias by concentrating on, and smearing, liberals by calling them communistic and un-American, while it has not touched fascist groups, nor investigated the recent activity on the part of the Ku Klux Klan.

Let us vote down this resolution and thus effectively terminate the committee itself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary says he wants Anglo-Saxon government. I do, too, but I do not want his interpretation of Anglo-

Saxonism. Actually, he advocates a type of totalitarianism although, very properly, he inveighs against all kinds of totalitarianism. He demands that the opinions of the people conform to his opinion. He thus discourages free speech and free press, the very essence of Anglo-Saxonism, and encourages the very opposite of Americanism. This committee, the Wood-Rankin committee, and its predecessor committee have caused no end of trouble, no end of embarrassment to this very Congress, because those committees have caused trepidation in the hearts and minds of the people of the Nation, and fear to express their own opinions; and you know, as well as I, that only on the anvil of free discussion and free opinion can we forge the truth. Maybe some of the members of this committee do not want the truth to be told.

I believe this \$75,000 that will undoubtedly be appropriated today will be just a waste of money as valueless as putting that money down a drain, as valueless as dropping a bucket into an empty well. We have spent—I asked this question but got no adequate answer—we have spent well-nigh a million dollars through the Dies committee and this current committee. What have we got from that? Nothing constructive. As I asked in my question to the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee: Can you give me one single bill that was an implementation of the recommendations of either the Dies committee or the Wood-Rankin committee? The gentleman from Texas was silent. Of course he was silent. Not a single recommendation has been carried out by this House; and thus well-nigh to a million dollars has been utterly wasted and been of no force and effect whatsoever.

This committee has resulted in dangerously splitting and splintering our people into hostile groups. In addition to the fact that no one bill has been passed, the activities of this committee have created festering sores of prejudice and intolerance in many parts of this country, and for that reason I hope this resolution will be voted down.

Instead of judicial fairness and decorum prevailing in the committee hearings, we have noted browbeating of witnesses, badgering of witnesses, and unjustifiable tirades against witnesses.

We constantly hear the committee making charges of un-Americanism before adequate proof thereof. We hear of intemperate remarks and diatribes about organizations and its members without them being given a chance of refutation or defense.

If some of the committee members had their way they would put plugs into the ears of the Nation, gags in mouths, and blinders on eyes, because they want the Nation to see, hear, and speak only what they desire.

With them open criticism and discussion is taboo, if it be on a subject or cause with which they disagree.

Anyone who disagrees with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is a Communist or un-American. The red

herring is constantly drawn across the trail.

I loathe communism. I want no truck with it. But freedom of speech and press is too precious. It cannot be denied even to a Communist. If the gentleman from Mississippi could deny freedom of press and speech to a Communist, the door is open to deny such freedom to an anti-poll-tax advocate and then to opponents of TVA, and finally to all who voice opposition to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and his views.

A rascal like Gerald L. K. Smith is treated by the committee with tender solicitude. He was able to use the committee as a forum to mouth at length his fascist views.

There is no satisfactory definition of "un-American." The gentleman from Mississippi calls anything and anyone in disagreement with him and his views un-American. He uses his definition of "un-American" as a cloak to hide his own personal peevishness and prejudice.

Thomas L. Stokes, able and skillful columnist of the Scripps-Howard papers, questions:

Can it be healthy for our democracy to have the gentleman from Mississippi using a committee, with the whole Nation for its sphere of operations, to exploit his own fears and prejudices?

Shall we thus spend another \$75,000 for such a dangerous purpose?

That gentleman has too many mental blind spots. He is unable to appreciate that others have opinions and will get them marketed.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the basic issues should be dealt with here with respect to this committee.

Just what is the committee? And what has it done?

We must judge it by its trend, and we must judge it by its actions. The record will show that the trend of this committee has at all times been to attack pro-Democratic organizations in this country and anti-Fascist organizations in this country. The record will also show that the test of what is subversive and what is not subversive has been the political standards of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. No one can deny that. His viewpoint has been a most aggressive one and it has been impressed thoroughly on the committee. The committee has acted accordingly. The gentleman is entitled to his views, but when we consider what the gentleman's views are on what is American and what is un-American and when we consider that this committee has made the gentleman's views the standard and the test by which investigations of various organizations are to be conducted, then I submit that this committee is no longer an impartial committee but is a committee acting as a vehicle to strike down those anti-Fascist and democratic organizations that entertain pro-Democratic and anti-Fascist views which are incompatible with the views held by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Let me give you specific illustrations. Organizations that have been advocating

FEPC, like the Federation of Constitutional Liberties, are subjected to investigation and contempt proceedings; organizations opposed to the continuance of the poll tax are subjected to investigation and contempt proceedings; organizations that have been advocating friendly relations with the Soviet Union are subjected to investigation and contempt proceedings. Right here this morning we have had the illustration of how certain gentlemen want this committee to function. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] wants the American Veterans' Committee investigated because a group of them picketed his home. The gentleman from Mississippi himself has pulled out a letter wherein someone is asking for funds for a campaign to unseat the gentleman from Mississippi. What is subversive about that? Since when has an attempt to overthrow the gentleman from Mississippi become synonymous with an attempt to overthrow the Government of the United States? Yet these organizations will be subjected to investigation. And all under what guise? The old red boggy.

Assuming that we do find a Communist here and there in some of these organizations, the test is what are these organizations doing? Are their activities pro-democratic or are they not? If they are, irrespective of who may be in that organization, it is the activity that counts, despite the fact you may find some people in them who happen to belong to the Communist Party. They have a perfect right to engage in democratic activities just as much as a Republican, Democrat, or Laborite has. The test is the activity itself.

Do you know what is going to happen if you give this committee this \$75,000? I can understand why the Republicans want to vote for this appropriation. It is going to be used for Republican campaign material. You are going to go after the Independent Citizens Committee, the PAC, and the CIO Political Action Committee, and all this will be done by the old technique of raising the red boggy. There it is, the applause. It bears me out. The gentleman from Mississippi leads the applause and the Republicans follow him with their applause. This applause most dramatically proves my point, that this committee will be used to advantage by the Rankin-Republican alliance against the progress and liberties of the American people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the gentleman has 7 minutes, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the gentleman printing his remarks at this point.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can add anything to this argument. The House very well understands the situation. I do want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that America is the only republican form of government in this world engaged in the last two wars that has maintained its form of government. Foreign isms and ideologies are running rampant in the world, yet America today is the only haven of refuge for the people who admire that form of free government that we maintain in this country.

The question has been raised here about the expenditure of \$75,000 to be spent by the Committee on Un-American Activities in the guardianship of our American free form of government, when we are expending millions—yea billions—of dollars for national defense, and the ability of this country to maintain that precious form of free government.

Where does the opposition to this committee come from? Just analyze that for a moment. Where does the opposition in this House with few exceptions come from? It is coming mostly from that group for which the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], who is neither a Democrat nor a Republican, speaks for in this House. He always leads the opposition.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman on more than one occasion has stated that the gentleman from New York is neither a Republican nor a Democrat. May I point out that on two occasions both the Republicans and the Democrats, the enrolled voters in my district, nominated me.

Mr. COLMER. I have no fault to find with what the gentleman's district does. If the gentleman's district wants to send him down here, it is perfectly all right with me, I have no complaint about that. But I still maintain that the gentleman is neither a Democrat nor a Republican, and I also maintain that he does not speak for either of those groups in this House. Who is it that the gentleman speaks for when he gets up here? Every time this question has arisen, the gentleman from New York has taken the floor and charged the committee with directing its activities largely toward the Soviet Union. I want to call the gentleman's attention and I want to call the attention of the country to the fact that in the Soviet Republic the laboring man, whom so many of you would speak for, has scarcely any freedom of choice of employment. I want to call your attention further to the fact that a certain large and aggressive labor union in this country, the CIO, is always defending the Soviet Republic.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I do not have time to yield any more. However, I would like to debate this

question with anybody in the House if the time permitted.

As chairman of the Postwar Economic Policy Committee, I, with six other members of that committee, visited the Soviet Republic last year. We saw, first hand, how labor was treated in that country. We saw those people working in those factories and we saw them working on those farms, and I say to you that they are virtually frozen to their jobs, and do not enjoy the right to strike. They do not enjoy the right, in most instances, of even the freedom of electing their own form of employment. I asked the superintendent of one of the large factories there, a pride of the Soviet Republic, if they had any strikes in that country. The gentlemen here who were with me will bear me out on what his reply was. No; they do not have any strikes in that country. He indicated that that was an American institution. I said, "What happens when the workers are dissatisfied?" He said that they were not dissatisfied. But I pressed the question about what would happen if they become dissatisfied.

"Well, in that case a representative of the trade-union and a representative of the factory just got together and everybody was satisfied," the superintendent replied. But he neglected to say that the representative of the trade-union and the representative of the factory were both key figures in the communistic government, that the trade-union was also a part of the government.

I asked the same question at the collective farm and I got the same answer. Nobody is dissatisfied, nobody strikes, and nobody changes his employment. Is that the form of government we want in this country? If that form of government threatens this country, then are we justified in investigating the activities of that form of government in this country? They have a right to their form of government there, but they have no right to force their form of government on us.

I say to you that we got the distinct impression from those with whom we discussed this matter there, both the Russians and our American representatives, that if a worker complained about either the working conditions or the pay for the fruits of his labor he was waited upon, usually at night, by a representative of the secret Russian police. He was then either glad to remain satisfied thereafter or was sent to the frozen regions of Siberia.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, I read recently where a group of vice presidents and representatives of the CIO visited Russia and came back and recommended closer cooperation between the Soviet trade-unions and the American labor unions. God forbid that the independent American workmen and farmers will ever be forced to work under such a system.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question about the subversive influences being at work in this country. It is a known fact that many Communists have worked themselves into key positions in our Government. I have been informed, off the record, by members of our armed forces that they have even infiltrated into the various armed services which are maintained for the defense of our country.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, since ours is the last of the major powers enjoying a republican form of government it behooves us to be on the alert. And while some of us have not always approved of all of the activities of this committee, I am confident that the vote here today will show that this House believes that the committee is doing a necessary and useful work and is performing a necessary function in calling to the attention of the country the dangers that threaten our Government. So far as I am concerned I shall vote for this appropriation with the conviction that it will be money well expended.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just preceded me would by inference stigmatize all of us who are opposed to the continuation of the Wood-Rankin committee as stooges or sycophants of the Soviet Union. He fails to accord to us the courtesy of respecting those in America who believe in upholding the Constitution and who believe rigidly and militantly in supporting a free press and freedom of speech in the United States.

For my authority, I quote Editor and Publisher in its issue of April 13. This publication can by no stretch of the imagination be denominated as radical or pro-Communist. In its issue of April 13, Editor and Publisher charges that the Wood-Rankin committee investigation of "opinion expressed in paid advertising copy"—for this committee investigated an advertisement in New York because it criticized the committee—"amounts to intimidation" and is "an attempt to control thought." It comments further, "If through such activities a branch of Congress can label such opinion 'good' or 'bad', 'right' or 'wrong', it need not go much further to do the same with the now free editorial expressions in our newspapers."

The pattern is wrong, the pattern of the Wood-Rankin committee. The pattern is that any organization which is trying to fight for democracy in America becomes suspect in the eyes of this strangely-adjusted committee. Yes, the committee appears very sympathetic with any organization which seems to uphold fascism but very critical of any organization which seems to oppose fascism.

Whom have they investigated? The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, an organization attempting to do something for the refugees from fascism in Europe. The American Committee for Spanish Freedom, also. Why? Because it is opposed to Franco fascism in Spain.

What have we created? We have before us a committee in Congress which has achieved such a reaction that the Washington Post, one of the great daily newspapers of our country has characterized the committee as an "ugly stain on Congress." We have such a performance in the committee that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS], one of the members, had Gerald L. K.

Smith before the committee, and asked him this question:

Mr. THOMAS. Would you say that the German-American bund was a Fascist organization?

Mr. SMITH. I would say that it was ideologically Fascist. I would not say that it was effectively Fascist. The only effective fascism that has really imperiled our people in their daily life in this country has been the administration of the New Deal bureaucracy.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, you have referred to the New Deal before. Would you say that it was more Fascist or more Communist?

Mr. SMITH. I would say that they employ the ideology of the Communists and the technique of the Fascists. I think Mr. Roosevelt was very much an imitator of Mr. Hitler.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. Roosevelt has passed away now.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; but he personified the New Deal.

Mr. THOMAS. Let him rest in peace. Would you say Huey Long was a Fascist?

Mr. SMITH. The answer is positively "No." This kind of smear testimony of our late President and of the legislation which through the years has strengthened American democracy and helped us win the war against the military might of fascism was met with the following comment from the chairman of the committee at the close of Gerald L. K. Smith's testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair expresses the appreciation of the committee for your testimony, Mr. Smith.

Apparently he spoke for the whole committee. There was no dissent.

I suggest the committee refrain from so conducting itself as to alienate the Soviet Union, and thus endanger world peace; that it do not give color to the charge that it is antilabor and antiliberal; that it investigate the Ku Klux Klan; that it look into Falange activities here; that its investigations be conducted ethically.

Because I believe the committee threatens the constitutional exercise of free speech on the platform and radio, I am opposed to the resolution to provide the committee an additional appropriation of \$75,000.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for the building of dams to hold back the devastating flood waters that would destroy our fertile valleys. Certain it is that this House could well afford to spend \$75,000 to build a small dam to hold back the overwhelming flood waters of alienisms that threaten to engulf this entire Nation. It is cheap insurance for the preservation of this Nation against that devastation. I am proud of the fact that I am a member of the American Legion which now supports and has always supported this committee. I believe that as long as the committee conducts itself properly, that organization will continue to so support it.

Mr. Speaker, March 26, 1946, I inserted in the Record on page A1741, a letter from the Kansas State Council, Knights of Columbus, urging my support for renewal of appropriations for the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The views of that organization are worthy of your serious consideration. Finally, Mr. Speaker, any organization that has nothing to hide has nothing to fear as the result of the investigations made or to be made by this committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] such time as he may require.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the continuation of the Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities is vital to the future security of our country, and, therefore, I strongly urge favorable action on the resolution to appropriate \$75,000 for the future work of this committee.

For more than 12 years the infiltration of Communists into Government policy-making positions has been of great concern to me. It should be of equal concern to every American who believes in our form of government and way of life. Those kindly and well-meaning citizens who permit themselves to be used as a front for communistic organizations are playing with fire. Little do they realize that they will be amongst the first to be liquidated after they have served the purposes of their sponsors. The Communists in this country could not get very far with their program to destroy our Government if it were not for the generous effort and contributions made by individuals and organizations that seek recognition and publicity. They submit themselves to the aggressive direction of well-known Communists, who receive all of their instructions from foreign sources. Thousands of individuals who have inherited great wealth but have never done any work whatsoever for living are the susceptible material to front for communistic activity in this country.

Another matter, but in the same general direction, is the infiltration of communistic activity in our schools and colleges under the slogan of academic freedom. It is well known that the long-range program of the Communist organization is to take over our educational system and capture recruits from the ranks of our young boys and girls. Wherever we turn, we note the well-planted seeds of this kind of un-American infiltration. You will find it everywhere, in schools, churches, labor organizations, political parties, in well-meaning social organizations and, above all, in the very core of our Government.

The time has come for the American people to stop, look, and listen. The time has come to devote a little of our time to the saving of our freedom from the clutches of those who seek to destroy the very foundations of our Republic. The time has come to stand up and be counted as being for or against our American way of life.

The Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities can and will perform an outstanding service to expose the activities of subversive individuals and organizations that seek to undermine and

destroy our Government and way of life. We owe it to the country to bring subversive activity to the light of day, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the continuation of the committee, and trust that there will be an overwhelming vote for the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad for this opportunity to have a thoroughgoing discussion of the "Wood-Rankin committee," as it is referred to in the Communist press, or of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the "Wood committee" as it is properly referred to in American circles.

I think it is important occasionally that our committee be required to come back to you and discuss the program upon which we are working, to solicit your counsel, and to request additional funds to continue our work. We are asking you now to vote the required money which this committee needs to continue its activities to the end of the current Congress.

In reality, this is the opportunity that several Members of the House, I do not know how many, have been seeking a long time since they have placed petition No. 12 on the Clerk's desk for the abolition of the committee. This is the opportunity for those of you who desire to abolish this committee to vote your convictions and to vote to abolish it by voting to cut out its funds because we do not have funds enough with which to operate more than another 30 days if you deny us today's request. If you vote "no" today, you vote to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee of Congress. If you vote "no" you might as well sign petition No. 12 and go the full route.

I think the issue is clear-cut. I discussed this resolution with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] the other day, and he said he thought we ought to have a roll-call vote on this issue. I said, "I agree with you. I will try to help you get one." I said, "Do you think you will get many votes against it?" He said, "I think we have 100 votes lined up against the measure." If that is correct, then that presents an interesting situation. I think the American people are entitled to know who those 100 Members of whom the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] speaks are as well as they are entitled to know who those Members are who are going to vote to continue the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I am going to join him in seeking a roll-call vote. This is an election year and that roll call should become an index which will be widely quoted in many congressional districts both in the primaries and in November.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield. I have referred to the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want to say to the gentleman I certainly will welcome very much a record vote on this issue. I am confident that time and events will

vindicate us who are opposed to this appropriation just as time and events vindicated those of us who opposed the Dies committee in the past.

Mr. MUNDT. I am afraid that such vindication as time and events will bring will afford but small consolation to the gentleman from New York and those who follow the gentleman in their voting today.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? In all fairness, in view of the fact this \$75,000 appropriation is a campaign appropriation to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and certain views of his, do you not think that this appropriation ought to be raised to \$150,000 and give some of us who are opposed to Ku Klux Klanism and opposed to Gerald K. Smith and who are opposed to those people who are opposed to the American workingman—

Mr. RANKIN. We are trying to protect the American way of life—

Mr. SADOWSKI. That we have another \$75,000 for political expression on our part also and not only a donation to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the political views that he represents.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. The statement to which we have just listened is about as nonsensical as anything we would expect to get from the enemies of this legislation. This \$75,000 will not help my campaign for reelection, but it will help us protect this country from the enemies within our gates.

This is not my committee. I am not trying to dominate it, but I can tell you now this committee is going after those un-American elements, in the House or elsewhere, who are attempting to undermine and destroy this Government.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. State who they are in the House.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, at the moment, I am not going to yield any further. There are some other factors which I want to discuss.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I demand the words of the gentleman from Mississippi be taken down. I want to know who the Members of the House are.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN. This is not my committee. I am not trying to dominate it, but I can tell you now this committee is going after those un-American elements, in the House or elsewhere, who are attempting to undermine and destroy this Government.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is compelled to hold that as the gentleman from Mississippi named no one, his words are not a violation of the rules of the House. [Applause.]

Now, the Chair does not desire to be applauded about decisions he makes in this chair, because he is trying to follow the rules.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota has the floor. Unless he

yields the Chair cannot recognize the gentleman.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. If this is to be taken out of my time, I cannot yield. Otherwise I shall be happy to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the floor. He can yield if he desires, but if he yields, it is taken out of his time.

Mr. MUNDT. Then I shall not yield further to anybody any further during the remainder of my remarks. The debate is getting too peppery and too personal, and I want to get back to some of the basic facts which this House should know. Let me say, first of all, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] stated that the viewpoint of this committee and the standards of our committee were the viewpoint and standards of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. That simply is not in accordance with the facts.

We have a nine-man committee, the chairman of which is the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. JOHN WOOD, a very able and a very patriotic American, in my opinion. There are nine members on this committee, six of whom are Democrats, three of whom are Republicans; and over half the actions of our committee have been taken by unanimous vote, and none of them have been dominated by the gentleman from Mississippi. Whether that speaks well or ill of the committee I do not know, but I do know that is a simple statement of fact.

If any one man in America has set the standards for this committee it is Mr. JOHN W. DAVIS, of New York, a former Democratic candidate for President. As part of my remarks I shall insert the significant portions of an advisory letter which Mr. Davis sent me at my request and in which he counseled our committee suggesting the procedures which we follow; and we have tried to carry them out faithfully, fully, and well. I think that even those who will vote against continuing the Un-American Activities Committee today and who will try to kill the committee by choking off its funds will hardly go so far as to deny that Mr. Davis is a great and a patriotic American.

Here are the words of Mr. Davis precisely as he wrote them to me in recommending how our committee should approach the prodigious problems which we face:

You are dealing primarily with matters of government, where it seems to me that the standards are perfectly clear and the function of the committee is obvious. There are three documentary sources by which un-American activities can be tested: the Preamble to the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution itself, and, if it can be treated as a separate document, the Bill of Rights. Those things which conform to these yardsticks, speaking in the political field, may properly be called American. Those which do not are un-American—or worse. I should think the activities of your Committee might properly be directed to ventilating any activities of whatever sort which challenge these standards, and to exposing the motives and the support of those who pursue them.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote further from the letter by Attorney John W. Davis. He said:

The fact that men have the right to speak or write as they please does not exempt their speech or writing from the field of your inquiry. It is not criminal, for instance, for any man or group of men to advocate the granting of patents of nobility, or the creation of a state-established church, or the disfranchisement of citizens because of creed, or the abolition of the right of private property; but it would be deeply un-American for them to do so.

Please note, my colleagues, that Mr. Davis clearly and carefully distinguishes between acts which are illegal or criminal and acts which are un-American. Your committee, it should be remembered, is charged by a mandate of this House to investigate "un-American activities"—we are not mandated as a police organization, we are not empowered to make arrests, and we are not directed to hunt down law violators or to trap criminals. Our task—to which you Members of this House assigned us—is to seek out and to expose those activities which although legal are none the less un-American, subversive, and contrary to the American concept. Mr. Davis points the issue clearly. We have operated in complete consistency with his suggestions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I continue to quote from the Davis letter. He wrote:

If someone were to proclaim that the Constitution of the United States was antiquated and should henceforth be ignored by governmental officers such advocacy might not become criminal, but it would unquestionably be un-American.

With remarkable foresight, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Davis envisaged precisely the type of activity in which various groups and their fellow travelers are now engaged in the United States.

Mr. Davis said further in his letter:

If any organized movement addressed to these ends should appear, I think your committee would render a public service by inquiring into its source, its resources, its activities, and the character of its membership. . . . I know of no better way to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States than to drag its enemies of whatever degree out into the open.

May I interpolate here, Mr. Speaker, to remind the House that in voting favorably as it did on the contempt citations which our committee has brought before you that you stand foursquare with that great constitutional lawyer, Mr. Davis, who recommends that the spotlight of publicity be turned on organizations suspected of subversive activities. Since our experience indicates that such organizations invariably utilize every conceivable legal technicality and dilatory tactic to avoid having its records inspected and to evade inquiring into its source, its resources, its activities, and the character of its membership that our committee and this House has no alternative in dealing with such an organization other than to cite it for contempt and to request the Attorney General to fulfill his duty and to proceed in court against it.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Davis advised our committee as follows:

I repeat, there is no challenge in this to the right of free speech. Sacred as that right is, it must, like all other rights, be exercised with a due sense of responsibility. Those who use it to incite crime or violence may be punished under the criminal law. But short of this, it does not invade this right to inquire concerning any statement un-American in character (such as I have undertaken to define it) as to who it was that said it, when and where and by whose instigation, and with what support. I should like to add that I conceive to be fully within the scope of the committee's jurisdiction those movements essentially disloyal in character which are designed to weaken the allegiance of their members to the United States or to favor some foreign sovereignty.

There you have it, Mr. Speaker. If the Congress and the country have wondered who has set the standard and proposed the concept which the House Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities is seriously and studiously endeavoring to follow, you now have the answer. It is spread in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where all who would can read. The criterion followed by our committee in its approach to the many problems before it is not the viewpoint of its chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, JOHN WOOD. It is not the viewpoint of the gentleman from Mississippi, JOHN RANKIN. Nor is it that of the gentleman from Arizona, JOHN MURDOCK, or any of the six other members of the committee. Neither the Democratic sextet nor the Republican trio writes the tune and directs the steps taken by this committee. It is a nine-man committee, in which each member has equal rights, equal influence, and equal opportunity to exercise his judgment. It neither follows the traditional procedures of the Dies committee, which preceded it, nor the ethereal elucidations of such a wobbly liberal as Henry Agard Wallace. It has endeavored, and it will continue to endeavor, to proceed in conformity with the sound counsel given it by John W. Davis and by other great Americans who believe our way of life is worth protecting and that eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

I might add that our committee also sought the counsel and guidance of the great Brookings Institution of this city. We had this scientific and impartial institution digest and summarize the counsel we received in over 50 thoughtful replies from leading Americans in every walk of life as to how this committee should function in meeting its mandate of investigating un-American activities. The Brookings Institution published a monograph on the subject and it gave our committee important and helpful advice which we are trying to follow. Any citizen interested can, I am sure, receive from the Brookings Institution a copy of its monograph on this subject. Its recommendations, however, are closely in harmony with those which I have quoted at length from the letter written by John W. Davis, of New York City.

Does any Member deny that there are individuals and organizations in the

United States who are preaching and practicing doctrines which are definitely un-American, even though they may be legal, in accordance with the definitive distinctions drawn by Mr. Davis? Does any Member deny that there are individuals and organizations in the United States today—plenty of them with vast finances behind them—which are "designed to weaken the allegiance of their members to the United States or to favor some foreign sovereignty"? Does any Member deny that within the broad leeways which we Americans rightfully insist freedom should have in this country there are individuals and organizations who plan and preach and plot and prepare and promote to the end that our constitutional system—the system our revered colleague from Texas, HATTON W. SUMNERS, today called the Anglo-Saxon system of Government—be weakened or impeded or impaired or destroyed?

Mr. Speaker, if there are Members of this body who really believe there are no un-American activities or individuals in this country, I invite them to take the floor on some early date and expose their naïveté to the public view. If there are none so naïve, what is it that influences Members to vote against funds to continue a committee to investigate and expose these subversive influences?

It should be noted here, Mr. Speaker, that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Knights of Columbus, the Masonic fraternities, the Elks lodge, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and many other great patriotic organizations and groups have time and time again endorsed the House Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities and have encouraged Congress to support and continue on a permanent basis a standing committee to investigate and expose all elements whether they be Communist, Fascist, or some native form of totalitarianism which would uproot and destroy our free way of life in this Republic. I shall save the Members who will vote against this resolution today the embarrassment of calling the roll of the organizations which have gone on record in opposition to this committee.

In all events, today you all have a chance to stand up and be counted. The leaders of both sides in this debate desire a roll-call vote. It is a poor vote to dodge. It will be a good vote to determine who supports and who opposes the efforts of Congress to protect America against those who would sabotage its constitutional liberties, its independence, and its concept of freedom.

It was suggested here by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] that we do not need a committee of this kind because the FBI could do this job. The FBI, however, is limited to the handling of illegal activities, to activities which are in direct violation of the law and to assignments by the Attorney General. As Mr. Davis points out in his letter, there is a field in which our committee must operate, dealing with factors,

people, and policies of organizations engaging in actions which are un-American even though their activities are legal. Because of the extreme privilege of free press and free speech they can do much harm if the nefarious purposes and people lurking behind their high-sounding organizational names remain unexposed.

The committee has investigated four organizations since Mr. Wood became chairman about a year ago. Three of them, I presume one might say, are operating from the "left"; one, I presume one might say, was operating from the "right." All were alleged to be engaging in un-Americanism. I am not going to name the organizations today, but our committee is disturbed and distressed by the fact that the three organizations which we endeavored to investigate, operating from the "left," refused to cooperate with the committee, refused to give us access to their books and records, refused even to comply with subpoenas. The one organization we investigated that was operating from the "right" invited us to send our inspectors and our investigators in to examine its books and records, and willingly submitted itself to complete examination.

I am going to insert at this place in the RECORD quotations from J. Edgar Hoover, who was highly recommended by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] a few minutes ago, and who is conceded by all good Americans to have a most excellent record. In these statements, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover points out the dangers of subversive activities in this country. I hope you will read these excerpts from his speeches. I shall quote them running all the way from 1940 up to about a year ago, but I shall not take time to read them here and now. You will find them at this point in the RECORD, however.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Not now.

Mr. KLEIN. The gentleman mentioned my name.

Mr. MUNDT. In a complimentary way; nothing derogatory. I desire to conclude my remarks.

EXCERPTS OF SPEECHES BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

[Address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, before the forty-seventh annual convention, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Milwaukee, Wis., over Red network of the National Broadcasting Co., at 11:15 a. m., September 9, 1940]

THE PRESENT TASK OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

Today, America has become the battleground of foreign agents. They spin their webs of alien philosophies to ensnare America, and in darkness weave insidious plans to scuttle our national defense. To counter and attack these vicious forces is the present task of law enforcement. Never have we had such responsibilities or opportunities. By protecting the rights of the citizens of this Nation, we are preserving the security of America.

We of law enforcement already are aware of the potential dangers that menace every community in the land. These increased burdens on law enforcement produce an open invitation to the underworld to plunder and destroy. However, the threats of the

underworld are of little consequence today compared to the threats of subverters who are bent on undermining and weakening our Nation, leaving it vulnerable to open attack.

There is no difference between the ruthless dictator of the criminal underworld and the high-handed political dictator of the upper world. Both deal in avarice, in greed, in lust for power, in mass murder and in blood purges. We in America believe that prison or the electric chair is the place for such menaces to civilization. If we would protect America, we must determine that no group of espionage agents or subverters, and no coalition of paid anti-American propagandists shall sway us from our American way of life.

[Address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, to opening session, twenty-second annual national convention, American Legion, Boston, Mass., at 10:45 a. m., September 23, 1940]

THE TEST OF AMERICANISM

The American Legion is an important bulwark of our national security. Today your organization takes on an added significance in a period of emergency, when all real Americans are united in a determination to protect our Nation. Fortunately, the Nation can depend upon you. You have been proven in the crucible of experience.

In other lands once free peoples are now subjected to the oppression of dictators. Fear and intolerance have taken the place of freedom, while force has become a dominant factor in world affairs. But of greater importance, American democracy once more is on trial. America must face facts. America must realize that the legions of force are making tremendous sacrifices for an ideal—an ideal which aims to destroy everything we hold dear. The people of the United States, in defense of their homes and their beliefs, must unite with that same singleness of purpose for which our forefathers fought in 1776 and for which many of your brothers in arms died in 1917.

From across the seas have come emissaries from totalitarian governments, seeking to undermine our nationalism and to implant their doctrines of hate. In spreading propaganda, these subversive forces have become more brazen. They have penetrated into every realm of decency, seeking allies in our schools, our churches and our civic organizations. Ever on the alert to capitalize on popular trends, they have joined reform organizations and civil liberties groups, and have played dominant roles in some of the pacifist blocs. Wherever they go, they contaminate, because of the indifference and apathy of too many of our citizens. As a result, our America is at the crossroads.

The time has come when we must make a choice. We can either resolve to protect our temples of liberty, or we can go blindly along believing that all is well. If we follow the latter course, we will some day find our liberties suddenly blacked out by the tyranny of a foreign dictator.

Our people are accustomed to taking liberty for granted. As a result, they have ceased to think seriously about it. But the foes of America have much to say about it. They construe liberty as license, and clamor for even greater license. Liberty and license are as far apart as liberty and tyranny. License breeds tyranny.

In recent days, insidious forces have sought to obstruct our national preparedness program by proclaiming that the strengthening of our Army and Navy abrogates liberty. The Communists, the Bundsmen and their allies of totalitarianism are seeking to weaken America's defense. These traitors, who shout of liberty as they seek to destroy it, tell young

people that they should refuse to take up their country's arms.

Americanism is on trial. Its real test lies in the ability of red-blooded Americans to meet and defeat the "fifth column" of destruction, which is already at work. A knowledge of the lurking menace is necessary. Also, there is need to avoid confusion if America is to remain strong. This can be achieved only through clear thinking and positive action. We must understand the problems of the day and how they can best be solved. We must understand that the priceless heritage of a free people is liberty. It is also their greatest achievement. But it must be rewon in each generation, through eternal vigilance and positive action.

Mere lip service to the letter of our democracy will not suffice. We need understanding and we need a renewed dedication to the spirit of liberty. This will not be easy to do. For a people to remain free, they must be courageous, self-reliant, willing to face the storms of life. Liberty is for the strong in spirit—not for the weak.

Action is necessary to prevent the bloodstream of America from contamination. There can be no procrastination. That this situation exists is no reflection upon the sincerity of the American people, but it does demand that we think straight and seek the truth. In this, the American Legion has set the pace. The necessity for its program, scorned and ridiculed by the Communists and their fellow travelers, has been thoroughly established.

This Nation will be everlastingly indebted to you Legionnaires for your devotion to the principles of our democratic Government. Born of devotion and sacrifice, the American Legion is a reassuring force in the preservation of our internal security. There is a need for your program in every community in the land.

Designated by the President to head the Nation's attack against foreign spies, saboteurs, and subverters, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is proud of its close cooperation with your organization. As the present emergency intensifies, it is only natural that we should depend increasingly upon you for assistance. You have never relaxed your vigilance against the foes of democracy. But now the time has come for you to broaden your program. Ever on the alert to practice Americanism, you must now redouble your efforts to teach Americanism. In short, this means that we must again emphasize the fundamentals that have made America great.

It is a sad commentary indeed that the teaching of religion has been so sorely neglected, because Americanism finds its most lofty expression in terms of spiritual development. The Ten Commandments cannot be improved upon, nor can the Sermon on the Mount be surpassed as a guide for ethical conduct. Yet the godless forces of totalitarianism scoff at everything spiritual and religious. They have used every device at their command to place their mouthpieces upon lecture platforms and in educational institutions to expound in a subtle manner, at times with a veneer of patriotism, their un-American theories.

Intellectual freedom is American. Intellectual license and debauchery is un-American. In righteous indignation it is time to drive the debauchers of America out in the open, where their true purposes may be revealed.

If their motivations are sincere, but due to ignorance, they have no right to instruct in the mental and spiritual development of America's youth. And if they espouse foreign causes, then they should be stopped from further debauching. There is no place in America for traitors steeped in the tyrannical and alien ways of life. American educational forces must come to grips in a uni-

fied manner with the needs of the hour, for the general purpose of stimulating the American people to renewed faith in democracy and a willingness to sacrifice in its defense if necessary.

[Address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, by transcription, in connection with the Youth and Democracy rallies sponsored by Aleph Zadik Aleph of B'nai B'rith in February 1941]

We have seen the "fifth column" developed as an effective part of this warfare. America has not been free from its threats. Vicious, subversive forces menace our national life to such an extent that the far-flung forces of the FBI, bulwarked by law enforcement everywhere, have been hard put to render full protection to our internal security.

The danger of these un-American activities is a real and present menace. Sneaking subverters work in the dark and with lying propaganda seek to undermine our freedom. While pretending to aid the less fortunate and the oppressed, they offer only sugar-coated tyranny and suppression of all liberty.

Just as the underworld seeks recruits among our youth, so do these godless forces of totalitarianism attempt to lure our boys and girls into the fear, the injustice, and the misery of slavery under dictatorship. Hypocritical organizations with high-sounding names have sprung up everywhere. Through these front organizations the Communists and goose-stepping bundsmen would educate America's youth along dictatorial lines. The very tolerance they would turn into intolerance has served them well and they are quick to charge "interference with the rights of the individual" when proper efforts are made to hamper their revolutionary activities. To the dictators they serve and to whom they would have us pay allegiance, individual rights are nonexistent.

In the countries whose ideologies they prattle, all life revolves around the state and the person; the family, the home are nothing. Unsympathetically dictators direct every act and thought of the boy or girl along rigid party lines.

Contrast this to America as we know and love it. Here all life revolves around the individual—the Government is his faithful servant, not always perfect but ever desirous to make his life more secure, more comfortable and more pleasant. In America we are free to search our own minds and the minds of others for the truth. Youth is a happy period of preparation for the fullness of life to follow.

The ambitions, strength of character, and the loyalties which give our individual lives their purposes and their goals are freely developed during our youth. In America, our boys and girls are free to choose the kind of a life they want and the only limitation to success is the individual capacity to succeed and not the quick purge of a jealous zealot.

The ideal in government which we have achieved in our Union is worth the hunger of the men at Valley Forge. It is worth the aching muscles and blistered hands suffered by the sturdy frontiersmen who shoved westward along unknown trails. What our forebears built for us is worth our working for and struggling to make more perfect. We want peace in which individual enterprise and application of energy will bring a fuller life to our people. To our citizens there can be no peace or fullness of life without the freedom we know so well.

It is only when our rights are involved or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. All Americans are devoted to the defense of our country, which has been built through sacrifice and matured by the wisdom of its most enlightened citizens.

If we defend America and its ideals our youth will never be found wanting. They, themselves, will guard against corruption by subversive activities. They will make sure that the subtle efforts of the undermining propagandist are ineffective. They will be alert to meet any threat to our democratic institutions, either from within or without. They will maintain the greatness of the United States of America. They will insure that a part of that greatness will spring from the freedom and tolerance of a fair and sympathetic but boldly just citizenry. If we dedicate our energies to all these things, democracy will be alive and strong and America will still be its greatest champion long after dictators have been relegated to oblivion.

[Address of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, at the annual commencement exercises, Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass., 2:30 p. m., June 29, 1944]

A GRADUATE'S RESPONSIBILITY

A graduation exercise is like the passing of another milepost. It brings you a little closer to your destination. When you will reach that destination depends on how you have charted your course.

The struggle in which we are engaged calls upon every man, woman, and child to be Americans first, last, and always, for America is merely the aggregate of all her peoples.

The Fascists and Nazis were not the only menace to our internal security. To their forces must be added the American Communists with their Godless, truthless philosophy of life. They are against the America our forefathers fought and died for; they are against the established freedoms of America. They pose behind a dozen fronts; they have endeavored to infiltrate practically every strata of life.

When they preach unity, let us not forget that when we were struggling to prepare for defense, they preached pacifism and fought our efforts to aid our allies and to build our common defenses. For true Americans there can be no unity with the enemy within and no compromise with those who would destroy all that we fight for. There is a distinction between respecting our ally Russia and respecting those within our country who would destroy all that we believe in. No one wishes to detract any from the glorious war history being written by the Russian people in protecting their soil. They are a great fighting nation and have done a masterful job at war.

But when it comes to governmental systems, we prefer our own American way, and we do not want the Communists in this country attempting to undermine our democracy or any of our institutions. I have said it before, and I repeat it now—America cannot exist half democratic and half Communist or Fascist. The Fascist-minded tyrant is no different from the native-born communistic corruptionist. We are proud of our American form of government. If we want to improve on it, we will do it in our own way, in our time, and with our own blueprint.

Over the years the American Communists have developed a propaganda machine and a nefarious and elaborate school system of their own. Their officials in secret and public meetings urge that the propaganda phase of their work must be accelerated. Brazenly, they have urged the development of courses, lectures, and assemblies as media to espouse the ideologies of Marxism and to establish Marxism as a school of thought in the United States. And even in the chameleon cloak with which they have now enshrouded themselves, the American Communists still proclaim their loyalty to Marxism, the antithesis of American democracy. The Communist

trojan horse has now become the trojan snake in American life.

They continue to pervert and complicate the solution of our perplexing domestic problems. That we have a growing problem of juvenile delinquency is known to all informed persons. The Communists also recognize this and see in it an opportunity for further infiltration. The mere association of the names American and democracy with the Communist youth movement does not make the organization either American or democratic. One Communist-front organization is now actively engaged in fostering youth recreation centers, a laudable project, were it not for the sinister purposes that motivate it. The enemies of our institutions realize the value of youth and recruit them for their purposes. They make many recommendations, but they overlook the one fundamental cause of delinquency: the American home. In fact, they openly state that the responsibility for the rise in juvenile delinquency must be placed elsewhere than upon the family in general.

The American home is still the basis of our social order, and the Nation will never be any stronger than the home. I urge that you who graduate today resolve, despite the interruption that faces you, to do your bit to preserve an American heritage for your children still unborn, and I hope the day will come when you will take your place in American life with a determination to restore it to its honored and rightful place in the social order.

Too many do not believe in a religious creed, and therefore do not live it. They bring forth from their personalities no fruits of vital religion.

Bestir yourselves to live by God's word and apply practically in your dealings with your fellow men the teachings of justice and equality toward all in all things. The mere recognition of this principle of tolerance is not enough. It must be translated into fact. The invoking of the procedures of law cannot accomplish it. There must be a willingness and determination by all to recognize it and live it.

What the postwar crime era brings will depend upon how well we can protect the home front. If there is a careful planning, if industry is quickly converted, if women who have left the home to help alleviate the manpower shortage return to their normal pursuits, if we can preserve our democratic ways, America should be bountiful enough to provide those who will work with a living that should satisfy the normal desires of life.

If circumstances force us to revert to fundamentals, if they require that superficialities be eliminated, then that will be a blessing to future generations. The path to truth is found in adversity which leads men to religion. America was ordained from on high, her destinies have been guided from on high, and if we Americans would only return in unison to the faith of our forefathers, to the simple faith that embraces hope and charity, our problems would appear as a mirage of the desert. It will not suffice to have a lofty ideal. There must be a fearless, strong-hearted devotion to that ideal if it is to become a part of our American life.

The Nation's call to duty, like God's call to man, is a personal one. It can be answered only by individuals. Care not what others may think. Be right. As you answer the call to duty, you merit the rights which are yours as an American.

As we respond to the duty of discharging our personal responsibilities, we should translate into action the words of George Washington—"Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the rest is in the hands of God."

Let me call attention to the fact finally, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Louis

Francis Budenz, of Notre Dame University, the former editor of the *Daily Worker*, a crusading Communist for 10 years, one of the directors of the American Communist Party and its spokesman in the columns of the *Daily Worker* recently appeared before our committee. We asked him why he had quit the Communist Party. I asked him what motivated him to make the change after his many years as one of America's leading Communists. He said the first thing was the fact that in Communist circles in this country there is no freedom of choice for the members of the party themselves; they are dominated and dictated to by the hierarchy of the American Communists. They lead controlled lives, taking orders from the top. He said: "I was losing my rights of American freedom in working with the Communist Party."

The second reason he gave was that the American Communist Party is dominated by foreign agents rather than by its so-called American leaders. Dr. Budenz attended the convention where Browder was forced out as national chairman and Foster was installed in his place. This change was directed by a French Communist who belongs to the International Communist Comintern. Thus American Communists, in the words of Dr. Budenz, serve simply as foreign agents and owe their allegiance elsewhere than to the United States. By infiltrating into respectable organizations and by forming unrespectable organizations with deceptively attractive and adroit titles, these Communist foreign agents utilize our American freedoms to undermine and destroy our American liberties. Some day I shall discuss some of the other revelations which Dr. Budenz made before our committee. My time today is about exhausted. Before concluding I do, however, desire to call to the attention of the House the last report filed by our committee. It is Report No. 1996, filed on the tenth day of this month, and it is now available in the document room.

REPORT NO. 1996

In this report, Mr. Speaker, our committee directs the attention of the House Ways and Means Committee to a situation which we discovered in the Treasury Department of the United States. It indicates one of the specific methods by which subversive groups in this country manage to fleece both the general public and the Public Treasury at one and the same time. I shall not discuss the report further at this time but I do commend it to the attention of the Congress and the country and especially to the members of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote on what is tantamount to a resolution to continue or to abolish the House Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. I hope it will be a roll-call vote. Each member can thus publicly record his convictions and he can square his action with his own conscience and his own constituency. I hope the verdict is decisive one way or the other. If America is to remain American, let us be alert to our responsibilities and let us face the issues squarely without alibi, evasion,

equivocation, or the use of red herrings to confuse the issues. If the American people and the legislators they send here to represent their convictions and reflect their attitudes desire to give the green light to subversive elements and to destroy the only committee in either House of Congress charged with the mandate of exposing and investigating their nefarious practices, then so let it be.

As for me, while I would welcome relief from the arduous and time-consuming duties which membership on this committee imposes, I shall vote to continue its existence and to finance its activity. To abolish this committee now simply because we are threatened by no open revolution would be as foolhardy as to destroy our fire department because we face no immediate conflagration, or to liquidate our Army and Navy because we are not engaged in hostilities. An old South Dakota rancher one time told me, Mr. Speaker, "The best time to cure snake bite is before it happens." I believe this is good advice for Congress to follow today.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] as he may desire.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in answering the unwarranted and derogatory statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], which he injected into the remarks of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I desire to say that I yield to no man in the love of my country and its democratic institutions, and I am sure that every Member whom the gentleman tried to libel is as patriotic as I am and as is the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, if I felt and could feel that the committee would investigate the real subversive activities and un-American propaganda, I would vote not only for this additional \$75,000 but for 5 times or 10 times as much. Unfortunately, neither the present committee nor the old Dies committee has functioned in a way to give me confidence in its impartiality of purpose or procedure. It is being used for assailing and attacking all persons of liberal views who believe in labor, in progressive and civic organizations, in democratic forms and processes of government, and in our constitutional guaranties of free speech, free religion, free press, and free expression of opinion. Notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] that hundreds of subversives have been found as a result of the old Dies committee investigations, they cannot give the names of any persons, after 6 years of expensive investigations, formally cited for un-American activities, except the three outstanding Americans, Robert Morss Lovett, William E. Dodd, and Goodman Watson; and the Supreme Court, in its recent opinion, has vindicated them.

FOR ALL THE WORK: 12 PAGES

The Dies committee and this committee have smeared, not one, but thousands of patriotic men and women, without giving them a chance to defend their fair names and reputations. I greatly

fear that under the leadership and direction of the gentleman from Mississippi, who appears to be the real head of this committee, with no reflection intended to the chairman, the same course is being pursued.

This committee has been in existence for 17 months. Up to now I find they have issued three little reports—if they can be called reports—comprising a total of 12 printed pages. Two of the reports deal with the same subject, the contempt citations against officers of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee of New York. There is no showing of evidence that this group published or distributed any subversive or un-American propaganda. On the other hand, considerable evidence has been offered to show that the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee raised and disbursed for the relief of republican refugees who fled from the persecutions of the bloody Franco regime in Spain some \$354,000 in 1945. This, according to the report made to the President's War Relief Control Board, did not go into any political propaganda, but to feed starving men, women, and children, and to furnish them drugs and medical care and clothing. Only about 10 percent of the total funds raised was used in promotion and administration; it seems unlikely they could have done much propagandizing. But, of course, to feed these republican children is, in the estimation of the gentleman from Mississippi, subversive.

SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY SPENT

The Dies committee and the present committee have expended a total of close on to \$700,000 of the taxpayers' money. These 12 skimpy pages of reports based on nearly 17 months of investigations cost the taxpayers about \$43,000 and no recommendations for legislation have as yet been made. You owe it to yourselves to go over these so-called reports.

I am informed that this resolution to appropriate an additional \$75,000, with still \$7,000 unexpended, was requested from the Committee on Accounts without a formal vote of the Committee on Un-American Activities; that only four members of the Committee on Un-American Activities appeared in behalf of the resolution, while no opponents of the appropriation were notified the resolution was coming up; that the gentleman from Mississippi was the only one who spoke at any length; and it has been charged that less than a quorum of the Committee on Accounts was present to act on the request. We all know that the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, the gentleman from Missouri, whom we admire and have confidence in, is ill in the Naval Hospital. We hope he will be able to return soon; but the fact remains that at the meeting in which this resolution was considered neither chairman was present, as I have been informed.

THESE SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED

On February 18 I sent to the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Propaganda Activities a letter protesting against the injudicious and one-sided procedure of the committee counsel and staff. I have yet to receive a reply to that letter; but again I wish to bring to

the attention of the committee and the House that the organizations that present a "clear and present danger" to the country have not been investigated. I am giving a list here of just a few organizations that are working against America; I will not go into long detail, but I insist that these groups are a greater danger to Americanism than those that have been subjected to the committee's investigations heretofore:

First. Ku Klux Klan: Newspapers have been filled with stories for at least 10 months about the resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan in the South and in California; the fiery cross burns on a hundred hills. Klansmen are reported to have stolen arms in California; the head of the Klan says he has hundreds of letters applying for membership. It is a matter of record that before the war the Klan cooperated closely with the German-American Bund to keep America from preparing for the war that was coming. Why is this un-American organization not being investigated?

Second. Nazi Party members lists: Committee counsel said not long ago he had been unable to discover any organized Nazi Party in America. The Kilgore subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee printed a list of dues-paying members of the German Nazi Party. Why are they not being investigated?

Third. National Economic Council: Almost every week I get literature from this organization headed and run by Merwyn K. Hart. What he preaches is a corporate fascism similar to Mussolini's Fascist Italy. Why is this not being investigated?

Fourth. Phony relief rackets: In Cleveland it was found that the Greater Cleveland Committee for Relief of Middle Europe was being organized by Otto L. Fricke, a former attorney for the German consulate, associated with the Nazi-financed American Fellowship, and an associate of George Sylvester Viereck and Friedrich H. Auhagen, and Karl Ernst, once associated with the official German Library of Information publication, Facts in Review. Before the close of the war Kurt Mertig was organizing a soft-peace movement, using the techniques Viereck used after World War I. The generosity of the American people is being used by these wily Nazi propagandists for their own end. Why are they not being investigated?

Fifth. Arab Office: The Anti-Nazi League has produced documentary evidence that the Arab office maintained in the Wardman Park Hotel has been cooperating closely with dangerous domestic organizations and has been engaged in propaganda activities to attempt "to control the thoughts" of Americans. Why has this not been investigated?

Sixth. American Action Committee: The dangers of ultranationalism have been proved in two world wars. Here is an ultranationalist coalition trying to change the American way of life. Is this being investigated?

Seventh. The Spanish Falange and Synarchism: Many writers have warned repeatedly about the growth of these twin Fascist movements in California,

New Mexico, Arizona, Texas, Louisiana, Florida, and New York. This is definitely revolutionary; the purpose is to overthrow this and every democratic government in the Western Hemisphere by force and violence, and it stems directly from the Nazi government. Why is this not being investigated?

HIDE UNDER PATRIOTIC NAMES

I shall not, Mr. Speaker, continue with this catalog of dangerous movements. There are many more. There are organizations which before and during the war were recognized tools of the Nazi Party. Some are appearing again under new names. Some are still functioning under their old names.

We must not be fooled by high-sounding patriotic and religious names. They are disguises seized by enemies of this country to weaken and divide us. Some are being operated by, or in cooperation with, the defendants still under indictment for seditious conspiracy.

Let me cite a brief list of organizations known to have cooperated directly with Nazi sources to illustrate how they steal the trappings of patriotism or religion to do their dirty work: Silver Shirts, Anti-Communist Federation of America, Knights of the White Camelia, Militant Christian Patriots, American Nationalist Confederation, Christian Mobilizers, American Nationalist Press Association, American Guards, Defenders of the American Faith, Order of '76, National Liberty Party. Those are but a few.

Tear away the masks, and you find they are conducting a vicious campaign of un-Americanism, in violation of our Constitution trying to divide our country and create prejudice against racial and religious groups.

DANGER FROM FASCISM

Some of the most outstanding American citizens, whom the gentleman from Mississippi surely could not charge with being disloyal, have warned us that there is greater danger to our democratic form of government from fascism than from those few misguided and so-called Communists.

This committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has been investigating various departments and agencies of the Government, trying to create the impression that there are thousands upon thousands of men and women employed by our Government who are antagonistic to our American way of life. Naturally, the Republicans will support this resolution because such an investigation reflects upon the administration adversely and they feel they will gain political advantage from it. They believe prejudice will be created against the administration and this will inure to the benefit of their campaign.

To them, and to those Democrats who follow the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. RANKIN] I say candidly they are not aiding their party.

MILLIONS FOR STATUTORY AGENCIES

We have appropriated millions for the FBI under the leadership of J. Edgar Hoover. Only a few days ago the House recognized his patriotism and efficiency.

So far as I am aware, and there has been no official statement otherwise to enlighten me, neither the old Dies committee nor the present committee contributed one whit to the indictments for seditious conspiracy now pending. That was done by the Department of Justice, by the Office of Naval Intelligence, by the Military Intelligence, and other statutory investigative agencies.

Yet, if we are to be guided by the gentleman from Mississippi and others who have spoken, we should discontinue these appropriations for Federal investigative agencies.

FOREIGN-BORN ARE LOYAL

As to the gratuitous slur against those Americans of foreign birth or foreign parentage made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNER], as I said to him, and I repeat, it was manifestly uncalled for because those who came to our shores to seek liberty and freedom and opportunity have proved their loyalty, industry, good citizenship, and patriotism in no uncertain way. They served their country and spilled their blood no less in World War I than in World War II; they acted with valor and distinction and wholeheartedly. Far from weakening our form of government and our democracy, they have strengthened it in every way, have helped to build up, develop, and enrich our Nation; and it is in great measure due those brave and courageous adopted sons and daughters that we have today the greatest, most progressive, and most prosperous country in the world.

COMMITTEE CLAIMS ARE DOUBTED

Those statements of great service to the executive departments—State, Justice, FBI, War, Navy, and so on—are ridiculous. I have inquired as to how many inquiries have been made by the different departments. They state uniformly that they have made a few inquiries because they try to obtain pertinent information from every source, even of this committee; but they state that they do not rely unduly on this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have contended in the past, and maintain now, that the FBI, with its trained investigative staff, is the proper agency of the Government to investigate subversive and un-American activities.

HOW ABOUT MILLIONS OF NAZI VICTIMS?

The gentleman from Mississippi, apparently for no other purpose than to create resentment and prejudice, would have us believe that thousands—yes; hundreds of thousands—are being killed in Poland under the new government. When has he shown sympathy for or called attention to the millions of these unfortunate Polish people slaughtered, massacred, burned, starved, beaten, clubbed, and tortured by the Nazis? It seems to me he has shown little interest in the victims of Nazi barbarism and cruelty, nor does he point out or criticize the actions of the Nazis, nor of the Falangists in Spain, who, according to reports, are daily shooting down those who seek freedom from Franco's bloody oppression and hordes of mercenary

Moors. At the same time he and his committee subjected to investigation and public derogation an organization which succored and aided the thousands of Spanish citizens who fled for their lives to France, Portugal, north Africa, Mexico, Cuba, and Ecuador.

MANY OPPOSE APPROPRIATION

I have had hundreds of letters and telegrams, Mr. Speaker, expressing opposition to the continuance of this witch-hunting Committee on un-American Activities and to the granting of any further funds. I concur wholeheartedly in the criticisms made of the committee's conduct and of the Member most responsible for bringing it to life and for its conduct, made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], the gentlemen from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO, Mr. CELLER, and Mr. O'TOOLE], and others, and regret that many others desirous of speaking against the appropriation could not gain time in which to be heard.

The gentleman from Mississippi at all times boasts that his activities are in defense of Christianity. I do not believe a real Christian would be so unfair, unjust, and intolerant of the rights and beliefs of others.

I have spoken already of subversive organizations which parade under patriotic or religious names and titles when in fact they are and always have been aided and financed and supported by Nazi and Fascist sympathizers at home and abroad, far more dangerous to our free institutions and national sovereignty than a committee feeding Spaniards who fled from death and a concentration camp. Many of these understudies and paid hirelings received pay or financial assistance from Vierick and his agents, some directly and some indirectly. Vierick has been imprisoned; but his stooges and hirelings, many of them, are still at large. Fascism is not dead. The Nazi idea is not buried with Hitler. If we are to give this money to the committee on un-American propaganda activities, Mr. Speaker, let us be sure it is going to be used to investigate all kinds of un-American propaganda.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

THE AUTHORITY AND FUNCTIONING OF COMMITTEE INCOMPATIBLE WITH ESTABLISHED AMERICAN JURISPRUDENCE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the issuance of the contempt subpoenas asked for by our House Un-American Activities Committee. If there is any Member who would be immediately intolerant of my words to be this day spoken, that Member could not have done more than I have in upholding the arms of the committee, when apparently within its jurisdiction as a duly constituted committee of this House. May I make it further clear that if the sum of \$75,000 is not sufficient to adequately protect the principle of the American form of government, as designated by our American Constitution as against threat of truly subversive activities or destruction by force, either from within or without, then I am in favor of appropriating a sum which is adequate. I will not knowingly tolerate the creation

of any propaganda or activity designed to result in the use of force or violence against our form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution. So with me, it is not the amount of money involved which is the determining factor.

The time of 1 hour is entirely inadequate and insufficient within which to this day determine the issues involved, for the substantial rights and privileges of American citizens are this day being determined upon. Frankly, I feel that much of the discussion which has preceded has been immaterial and irrelevant, so far as the issues before us this day are concerned. For, Mr. Speaker, the questions before us to decide are two: First. Is it necessary to have the Un-American Activities Committee as a committee of this House? Second. Is the committee set up as now constituted under House Resolution 5, passed January 3, 1945, consistent and compatible with the established principles of law and jurisprudence as practiced and followed in our beloved Nation?

Answering my own first question, I will frankly say that I believe the FBI is the only presently duly constituted and qualified agency of the American Government to protect the American Government from subversive un-American propaganda activities, either from domestic origin or from without our boundaries. A few minutes ago a gentleman stated that the FBI was not authorized under law to make such investigations, but I will say that he gave no authority for such a statement and that, assuming that his statement is well-founded, then I advocate the changing of our Federal statute so that the FBI is duly authorized within the law to handle this work. We take our hats off to this great investigating agency in all other matters, and why should it not apply the same integrity and ability to investigations of alleged un-American propaganda as well. It is the only agency of our Government financed, personneled, and giving full time to such assigned duties and responsibilities. What objection is there to assigning to it this duty now being more or less inadequately done by this House committee. I repeat that with me it is not a matter of expense. It is a matter of believing that the FBI is immensely more qualified and experienced to do this job. It is the agency created for such purposes, and it is the one agency that can do it most efficiently, effectively, and promptly, and without the taint of petty politics, personalities, persecutions, or prosecutions. Therefore, have it understood, gentlemen, that I favor our form of government being protected—but to the maximum. Therefore, I favor the study and investigation of un-American activities to be done by the FBI and not by a committee of this House which must necessarily be dependent upon change of personnel thereof and upon other emergencies and expediences which do not arise through systematic, thorough-going work by the FBI. We can remove any probability of just criticism or condemnation on our own House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any member thereof acting in the spirit and for the purpose of prosecution or persecution or defiance of political enemies or opponents by placing this un-

American activities investigation work in the FBI, where I believe it belongs. The fact that we are only taking an hour today to determine this highly important matter, and the fact that we only took an hour in the late contempt citations, should be proof that this House believes itself too busy with other matters, which it considers more important, to give enough time to this matter to do it full justice.

Explaining my second point, I will further say that it is incompatible and inconsistent with the established American law to permit any person to sit in dual capacity of judge and jury. It is likewise incompatible to allow any person to sit as judge or jury where that person has a personal interest in the outcome of the matter before the court or before the committee. Can there be any question but that at least one member of our present Un-American Activities Committee considers that he has a personal interest in the outcome of this appropriation of \$75,000, and that he has a personal interest in perpetuating this Un-American Activities Committee at this time, instead of allowing the FBI to do it, when within the last few minutes you heard and saw the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi take from his pocket and refer to a letter indicating that certain groups of people were soliciting money to campaign against him for reelection in his district in Mississippi in this very political campaign? Furthermore, I have frequently heard several Members of this distinguished body who are now strongly in favor of appropriating this money, speak in an emphatically intolerant vein against certain organized groups in America. Yet, some of these very Members indicate they are being opposed for reelection by these very groups in their own districts. If that is not establishing that they have a personal interest in the outcome of this committee's functioning, then what further evidence do we need? And, if any member of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House is being opposed for reelection by the group which has already been investigated or which it is proposed to investigate, how then can that committee member be unbiased and impartial in such investigation in an American way? A person undertaking to sit as a judge in a case and having such personal interest, would not only be considered unethical and biased, but might well be considered in terms of impeachment if such interest was undisclosed.

Such inconsistencies are not only unfair to the accused or to those being investigated, but such inconsistencies and procedures incompatible with our American way of life makes the House subject to just condemnation by the American public, in my judgment. Why should we not apply the same high ethical rules of conduct and substantial procedure to our own committee functioning and actions, as are universally applied to our American courts? No ethical lawyer would tolerate a judge sitting on a bench or a jurymen in the jury box, known by that lawyer to have a personal interest either directly or indirectly in the matter. Why then do we, as a House of this great

Congress, continue to so conduct these matters in a manner which is incompatible with the best traditions and principles of our established rules of court ethics and conduct?

If we would be perfectly frank with ourselves and our Nation at this moment, I doubt not that some Members of this House would be compelled to admit that they are desirous of appropriating this \$75,000 and continuing this committee at this time for the reason that the activities of the committee, under its present policy, will directly or indirectly help to strengthen the political campaign of some Members in this House.

Is this not an unsound basis on which to establish and conduct a committee of this house? Is it not rather the rights and freedom of American citizens to have the protection of the principle of the form of our American Government as guaranteed by our Constitution, which should be the sole objective of the expenditure of this money? I believe that the continuation of our form of government within the limits of our Constitution is the ideal and objective we should fight and work for, and that it is shamefully inconsistent for us to allow the political destiny of any individual, or party, or group to be determinative of our action in the premises. I believe, furthermore, that any Member of this House who finds he has a personal interest in the outcome of any investigation at any time should not function on the committee, or should at least refuse to sit as a member of the committee in its quasi-jurisdictional capacity during the time that such investigation is moving forward. That is what an ethical, honest-to-God judge in a court would do. Why should we establish a committee which functions in a judicial capacity to a large extent and permit it to violate the established tenets of our American jurisprudence?

In making these remarks I do not intend to criticize any Member of this House nor any committee of this House. I do criticize the system by which we are presently functioning in this particular.

Lastly, House Resolution 5 does not define nor undertake to delineate what constitutes un-American activities. There is no boundary line, no definition, no chart or compass by which our committee is governed as to what does or does not constitute un-American activities. Yes, I know that in section 40 (c) it specifies that it relates to the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda. But, gentlemen, what is subversive activities? What is un-American propaganda? Who is to determine what constitutes subversive and un-American activities? Congress has never defined the same, nor has the Un-American Activities Committee of the House defined what it considers subversive or un-American activities. Therefore, we now find ourselves in a position where, in this particular, we are governed by the temperaments and decisions of men who are not yet bound by the determination of the Congress as to what Congress itself determines to be subversive or un-American.

I strongly advocate the earliest possible determination by Congress of what should guide the committee in this particular. I strongly advocate the earliest possible hearing before the Supreme Court to get a decision on "all fours." Ours must be a government of fundamental laws and not a government dependent on personalities, frailties, or complexes of men. For this reason, among others, I again advocate that this highly important and necessary work be done by the FBI. I have no sympathy or accord with any person or group of persons who are interested in the overthrow or dissolving of our American form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution. I shall fight to the last ditch against any propaganda so designed. I regret any expression in words by any Member of this House which may indicate that any Member of the House who opposes this appropriation is therefore classified as un-American. Such expression by any such Member is further added proof of such intolerance of other men's sincere opinions, as requires that this sort of investigation and protection of the American form of government should only be done by those who do not have personal political interest in the outcome thereof, and be done by those who are primarily charged with that duty. To this end I bespeak that our beloved form of American government, as guaranteed by our Constitution, would be best preserved by rules of law consistent with our American jurisprudence instead of by the differences of men who do not yet have any law or definition to govern their acts in such matters.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, last week end the Democratic Party of Wisconsin had its biennial State convention at which a thousand delegates were present, a good cross-section of the State of Wisconsin, including farmers, business men, housewives, teachers, and workers. That convention voted unanimously asking that the Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished. This action was taken because the convention recognized the smear technique that is being used, a smear technique as old as American history. In the days when reactionary and conservative politicians used the word "Jacobin" instead of "Communist" they termed Thomas Jefferson and his disciples Jacobins. That was the great cry of that day. In the days of Andrew Jackson, the phrases were "Barnburners" and "Loco Focos."

In other words, those who fought for democracy and who fought for the rights of the people have always been smeared by the reactionary and conservative politicians.

Wisconsin Democrats believe that is what the present set-up is—more smear technique in the worst tradition of American reactionaries.

Also we have not forgotten the so-called investigation of Gerald L. K. Smith, arch-Fascist, by the Dies committee. The committee, supposed to

represent the dignity and honor of the United States Government and of this House, listened for hours to a diatribe against our late revered President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. They listened while an avowed Fascist branded Mr. Roosevelt a Communist, a Fascist, and a traitor. And not one single member of that committee who was present raised his voice in protest.

Are we to spend the taxpayers' money to have one of our greatest Presidents vilified? Are we to obtain free publicity for the worst enemies of our country to smear our national leaders? I am convinced that the Committee on Un-American Activities does not serve the best interests of this country and I am opposed to giving them one red cent to continue their red-baiting and rumor-mongering.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

AMERICANISM VERSUS COMMUNISM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the line is fairly well drawn here today between Americanism and communism.

The ones who attack the Committee on Un-American Activities and misrepresent it throughout the country, of course, are opposed to one dollar being appropriated for that committee to help protect the American institutions against un-American activities of those elements that are conspiring to destroy this Government.

The leader on the other side, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANONIO], took considerable pains to attack me. You remember during the Hitler-Stalin pact, when the Communists were picketing the White House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANONIO] voted against every single appropriation for national defense, and if his policy had been carried out untold thousands of American boys would have died in this war for want of the weapons with which to fight. If I remember correctly, on the vote on one naval appropriation bill the measure passed by 383 to 1—that one opposing vote being cast by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANONIO]. This is no personal matter of mine. I was not present when the committee voted to investigate some of these very organizations that have been mentioned here today, but when we brought them in and it was indicated that they were engaging in some surreptitious un-American activities, and the committee, in accordance with the mandate of this Congress, demanded that they show their books, and they refused, we cited them for contempt, and everyone who has attacked me or the Committee on Un-American Activities here today, or practically every one of them, voted against that citation.

Let me say a word in reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] with reference to the Poles—those unfortunate persecuted people of western Europe from whom he is descended. I wonder if he knew that the atheistic Communists have raped more innocent women, murdered more innocent men,

plundered more helpless individuals, and robbed more homes than has ever been done before within the confines of the Polish Empire in all the history of European civilization?

In one of their booklets advocating a "Negro Soviet" for the Southern States—

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I cannot yield.

In other words, when they take over, as the Communist leaders boast they are going to do, the white women of the South would suffer the same fate as is now being meted out to the helpless Christian women of Poland.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me, because he mentioned my name?

Mr. RANKIN. No, Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield. He got up here and made an unwarranted attack on me a while ago, and I shall decline to yield to him. By his attacks on this committee, he is encouraging those Communists who are destroying the Christian people of Poland and plotting the overthrow of the Government of the United States.

Some men came in to see me the other day, men with the strains of worry in their faces. They said, "We are not from Europe, but our people live there." Some of them were in Poland, some in Czechoslovakia, some in Latvia, Lithuania, and some of them were from other Communist-occupied countries. They said, "Letters are pouring into our people not by the tens, not by the thousands or the tens of thousands, but by the hundreds of thousands from the Christian men and women of occupied Europe appealing to America to do something, to get America to put a stop to the raping of innocent women." Christian women, if you please, the people from whom many of you sprang, "the murdering of innocent men, the plundering of their homes and the robbing of the peasants." Read our own press reports of what took place in Bulgaria and shudder.

This same element of atheistic Communists are undermining this Government, raising money, if you please, to go into the individual congressional districts to try to defeat real American Congressmen in order to get control of the Government of the United States.

They shall not pass!

Now let us call the roll.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending legislation, and I desire to say that it is my opinion that, it is more important than ever in the history of our country that the work and activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities should continue. Mr. Speaker, I think that this appropriation will be money expended in a most important and necessary way. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to say also that I appreciate the work that the former Committee on Un-American Activities performed under the leadership of a former Member of this House, the Honorable Martin Dies, and I would respectfully recommend to the Members of this House, for preferred reading, the book entitled "Trojan Horse in America" the author of which is Mr. Martin Dies.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240, nays 81, answered "present" 1, not voting 108, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—240

Abernethy	Fuller	Murphy
Allen, Ill.	Gary	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, La.	Gathings	Murray, Wis.
Almond	Gibson	Norblad
Andersen	Gillespie	Norrell
H. Carl	Gillie	O'Brien, Mich.
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	O'Hara
Andresen	Gossett	O'Konski
August H.	Grant, Ala.	O'Neal
Andrews, Ala.	Grant, Ind.	Pace
Angell	Gregory	Peterson, Fla.
Arends	Griffiths	Peterson, Ga.
Arnold	Gross	Phillbin
Auchincloss	Gwinn, N. Y.	Phillips
Barrett, Wyo.	Gwynne, Iowa	Pickett
Barry	Hagen	Pittenger
Bates, Ky.	Hale	Ploeser
Bates, Mass.	Hall	Poage
Beall	Edwin Arthur	Price, Fla.
Beckworth	Hallock	Priest
Bennett, Mo.	Hancock	Rains
Bishop	Hare	Ramey
Bolton	Harness, Ind.	Randolph
Boykin	Hays	Rankin
Bradley, Mich.	Hendricks	Reed, Ill.
Brehm	Henry	Reed, N. Y.
Brooks	Hertzer	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Ga.	Heslton	Richards
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Riley
Bryson	Hill	Rivers
Buck	Hobbs	Rizley
Buffett	Hoeven	Robertson, Va.
Bulwinkle	Koffman	Robison, Ky.
Burch	Hope	Rockwell
Butler	Howell	Rogers, Fla.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jennings	Rogers, Mass.
Camp	Jensen	Sasser
Campbell	Johnson, Calif.	Schwabe, Mo.
Canfield	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Okla.
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson,	Scribner
Case, S. Dak.	Luther A.	Shafer
Chapman	Johnson, Okla.	Sharp
Chelf	Jones	Short
Chenoweth	Jonkman	Sikes
Chiperfield	Judd	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Keerney	Slaughter
Clements	Keefe	Smith, Ohio
Clevenger	Kelly, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Clippinger	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Cole, Kans.	Kilday	Sparkman
Cole, Mo.	Landis	Springer
Colmer	Lane	Stefan
Cooley	Lanham	Stevenson
Cooper	Larcade	Sumner, Ill.
Corbett	Latham	Summers, Tex.
Cox	LeFevre	Taber
Cravens	Lemke	Talbot
Crawford	Lesinski	Talle
Cunningham	Lewis	Tarver
Curtis	Lyle	Thomason
D'Alesandro	McConnell	Tibbott
Daughton, Va.	McCowan	Trimble
Davis	McGehee	Vinson
Dirksen	McGregor	Vorys, Ohio
Dolliver	McKenzie	Vursell
Dondero	McMillan, S. C.	Wadsworth
Doughton, N. C.	McMillen, Ill.	Weichel
Drewry	Mahon	West
Durham	Maloney	Whitten
Dworshak	Manasco	Whittington
Earthman	Mansfield, Tex.	Wickersham
Eaton	Martin, Iowa	Wigglesworth
Ellis	Martin, Mass.	Wilson
Ellsworth	Mason	Winstead
Elsaesser	Mathews	Winter
Elston	May	Wolcott
Ervin	Marrow	Wolverton, N. J.
Fallon	Michener	Woodruff
Fellows	Miller, Nebr.	Worley
Fenton	Mills	Zimmerman
Fisher	Morrison	
Flannagan	Mundt	

NAYS—81

Bailey	Granahan	Marcantonio
Baldwin, N. Y.	Granger	Miller, Calif.
Barrett, Pa.	Green	Neely
Biemiller	Hand	O'Brien, Ill.
Bloom	Harless, Ariz.	O'Toole
Bradley, Pa.	Havenner	Outland
Carnahan	Healy	Price, Ill.
Celler	Hedrick	Rabaut
Coffee	Hollifield	Rabin
Crosser	Hook	Rayfiel
Dawson	Huber	Rea
Delaney	Hull	Robinson, Utah
John J.	Izac	Rogers, N. Y.
Dingell	Jackson	Rowan
Douglas, Calif.	Johnson	Ryder
Douglas, Ill.	Lyndon B.	Sabath
Doyle	Kean	Sullivan
Eberharter	Kee	Sadowski
Engel, Mich.	Kefauver	Savage
Feighan	Kelley Pa.	Sheridan
Fernandez	Keogh	Smith, Maine
Flood	King	Somers, N. Y.
Fogarty	Klein	Spence
Gallagher	Kopplemann	Stockman
Gardner	McGlinchey	Sullivan
Geelan	Madden	Thomas, Tex.
Gordon	Mansfield,	Tolan
Gorski	Mont.	Voorhis, Calif.
		Woodhouse

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Murdock

NOT VOTING 108

Adams	Gearhart	Morgan
Andrews, N. Y.	Gerlach	Norton
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	Patman
Baldwin	Gillette	Patrick
Bell	Gore	Patterson
Bender	Graham	Pfeifer
Bennet, N. Y.	Hall	Plumley
Blackney	Leonard W.	Powell
Bland	Harris	Quinn, N. Y.
Bonner	Hart	Reece, Tenn.
Boren	Hartley	Rich
Brumbaugh	Hébert	Robertson,
Buckley	Heffernan	N. Dak.
Bunker	Hinshaw	Rodgers, Pa.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoch	Roe, Md.
Cannon, Fla.	Holmes, Mass.	Roe, N. Y.
Carlson	Holmes, Wash.	Rooney
Case, N. J.	Horan	Russell
Clark	Jarman	Sheppard
Clason	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Cochran	Johnson, Ind.	Starkey
Cole, N. Y.	Kerr	Stewart
Combs	Kinzer	Stigler
Courtney	Kirwan	Sundstrom
Curley	Knutson	Taylor
De Lacy	Kunkel	Thom
Delaney	LaFollette	Thomas, N. J.
James J.	Lea	Torrens
D'Ewart	LeCompte	Towe
Domengeaux	Link	Traynor
Elliot	Luce	Walter
Engle, Calif.	Ludlow	Wasielewski
Folger	Lynch	Weaver
Forand	McCormack	Weich
Fulton	McDonough	White
Gamble	Mankin	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gavin	Monroney	Wood

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Forand against.
Mr. Knutson for, with Mr. De Lacy against.
Mr. Roe of Maryland for, with Mr. Bennet of New York against.

Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Rooney against.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Patterson against.

Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.
Mr. Roe of New York for, with Mr. Fulton against.

Mr. Kinzer for, with Mr. Bender against.
Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Torrens against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Bunker with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Hart with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. Quinn of New York with Mr. Graham.
Mr. Hoch with Mr. Holmes of Washington.
Mr. Monroney with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Courtney with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Carlson.
Mr. James J. Delaney with Mr. Brumbaugh.
Mr. Folger with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Link with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Boren with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Sundstrom.

Mr. Lea with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Combs with Mr. Andrews of New York

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may have permission to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include two resolutions.

Mr. BUNKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McGEHEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Oscar Vogl.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include extraneous matter in both instances.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Secretary Wallace at Detroit.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Chicago Tribune on heroism of our colleague, EDWARD A. KELLY.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address by Herbert Hoover, and in the other to include an editorial.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each instance to include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article written by Roy Richards which appeared in the newspapers of May 15.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a press statement.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in two to include editorials, and in the third, a news item.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Let's Talk Direct to Russia" taken from the Detroit Free Press.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the legislative director of the American Veterans of the World War concerning veterans' pensions, together with a table.

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of the program for the memorial services to be held on May 28.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 353.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 403 (d) (3) of the Revenue Act of 1942 (relating to the release of certain powers of appointment) is amended by striking out "July 1, 1946" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1947"; and section 452 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1942 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Release before July 1, 1947:

"(1) A release of a power to appoint before July 1, 1947, shall not be deemed a transfer of property by the individual possessing such power.

"(2) This subsection shall apply to all calendar years prior to 1947 and to that part of the calendar year 1947 prior to July 1, 1947."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have an explanation of this resolution.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 353 is an amendment to the Revenue Act of 1942 further extending the time for the release of powers of appointment for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. It has been extended several times in order to allow those persons holding such powers to readjust their affairs and release such powers without incurring liability to estate or gift tax. The Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Treasury Department, and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation are studying this matter, and they think they will soon be able to make a report as to certain changes necessary to be made in the law. It is important that we grant this further extension in order to give further time so that the matter can be studied and appropriately legislated upon. May I say that it has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. It amounts to this as the lowest common denominator: Under the revenue law of 1926 these estates, where there was an appointment either to a person to handle the estates or the person administering them in a will or trust or otherwise, escaped taxation. The law was changed in 1942 to make them taxable, and the result has been that hundreds of thousands of wills have had to be reexamined and are still being reexamined throughout the country. These extensions are simply to do justice to these people who drew their wills and made these appointments under the law of 1926.

This joint resolution extends to July 1, 1947, the period for releasing certain powers of appointment without incurring liability for estate or gift taxes.

The Revenue Act of 1942 made a number of significant changes in the law dealing with powers of appointment which affected holders of preexisting powers, among which there were many fiduciaries.

To determine whether these powers, even though not exercised, were subject to the estate or gift tax, required a thorough investigation of many trust instruments and wills and involved complicated questions of interpretation of State and local law.

In order to enable holders of these powers to adjust their affairs in the light of new legislation, Congress provided in the Revenue Act of 1942 that such powers could be released prior to January 1, 1945, if the power was created on or before October 21, 1942. Subsequent amendments have extended this date to July 1, 1946.

The entire legislation of the 1942 act relating to powers of appointment is being reexamined by our joint staff, the Treasury staff and outside groups, including the American Bar Association and the American Bankers Association, and undoubtedly, amendatory legislation will be proposed.

It is believed that the studies of these groups will have been completed in sufficient time to permit us to legislate on this matter prior to July 1, 1947, particularly in connection with preexisting powers.

In view of these considerations, our committee has deemed it advisable to grant a further extension for the release of powers of appointment. This resolution, accordingly, extends the grace period up to July 1, 1947, so that the matter can be entirely canvassed and desirable changes made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY BILL OF 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations this morning held hearings at which the question of Army personnel came up. No one was able to tell us whether or not the estimates that were submitted to the committee were based upon the same figures that were available to the conferees during their consideration of the pay bill. Will the gentleman tell us the date of the figures which were used in determining the ceiling for Army personnel? I notice the report as printed in the Record indicates a ceiling of 176,000 for the War Department at the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1947.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The inquiry of the gentleman from South Dakota is very pertinent, because the figures for the War Department were given to the committee of conference last week and agreed to by the Budget, so they are the very latest figures. I am certain we can predicate our action upon that information.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In working on the appropriation bill and considering the personnel requests for the different branches, we should have the figures which were submitted to the committee of conference, otherwise there would be no legislative authorization for employment of a larger number of people.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct in that observation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am going to withdraw my reservation of objection but, before doing so, may I say that I think the conferees have done well with a very difficult job. They had two bills before them, neither one of

which was entirely satisfactory. The final result appears to me to be unusually good, considering the extreme positions from which the committee had to work. I congratulate the conferees on the work they did, and express my appreciation of the long series of conferences they had and the effort they put forth to accomplish the results achieved.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946'.

"INCREASE IN CLASSIFICATION ACT PAY RATES

"SEC. 2. (a) Each of the existing rates of basic compensation provided by section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended and supplemented, except those affected by subsection (b) of this section, is hereby increased by 14 per centum or \$250 per annum whichever is the greater, except that no such rate shall be increased by more than 25 per centum. Such augmented rates shall be considered to be the regular rates of basic compensation provided by such section.

"(b) (1) The proviso to the fifth paragraph under the heading 'Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Service' in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Provided, That charwomen working part time be paid at the rate of 90 cents an hour, and head charwomen at the rate of 95 cents an hour.'

"(2) Such section is amended so as to provide the following rates of compensation for positions in the clerical-mechanical service:

"Grade 1, 90 to 97 cents an hour.

"Grade 2, \$1.04 to \$1.12 an hour.

"Grade 3, \$1.20 to \$1.27 an hour.

"Grade 4, \$1.35 to \$1.49 an hour.

"(c) The increase in existing rates of basic compensation provided by this section shall not be construed to be an 'equivalent increase' in compensation within the meaning of section 7 (b) (1) of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"INCREASE IN PAY RATES FOR CUSTOMS CLERKS AND IMMIGRANT INSPECTORS

"SEC. 3. Each of the existing rates of basic compensation provided by the Act entitled 'An Act to adjust the compensation of certain employees in the Customs Service', approved May 29, 1928, as amended and supplemented, and those provided by the second paragraph of section 24 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended and supplemented, are hereby increased by 14 per

centum or \$250 per annum whichever is the greater, except that no such rate shall be increased by more than 25 per centum. Such augmented rates shall be considered to be the regular rates of basic compensation.

"INCREASE IN STATUTORY PAY RATES IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH NOT UNDER CLASSIFICATION ACT

"SEC. 4. Rates of basic compensation specifically provided by statute (including any increase therein computed in accordance with section 602 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945) for positions in the executive branch or the District of Columbia municipal government which are not included in section 102, as amended, of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 or in the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, and are not increased by any other provision of this Act, are hereby increased by 14 per centum or \$250 per annum whichever is the greater, except that no such rate shall be increased by more than 25 per centum. Such augmented rates shall be considered to be the regular rates of basic compensation.

"INCREASE IN PAY RATES IN THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

"SEC. 5. (a) The first sentence of section 501 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'plus (A) 14 per centum of his rate of compensation (including the additions thereto resulting from the application of the foregoing percentages), or (B) \$250 per annum, whichever is the greater, except that such rate of compensation shall not be increased by more than 25 per centum'.

"(b) The second sentence of such section 501 is amended to read as follows: 'The additional compensation provided by this section and section 502 shall be considered a part of the basic compensation of any such officer or employee for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.'

"(c) Section 502 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION IN LIEU OF OVERTIME

"SEC. 502. Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch entitled to the benefits of section 501 of this Act shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 10 per centum of the aggregate of the rate of his basic compensation and the rate of additional compensation received by him under section 501 of this Act.'

"INCREASE IN PAY RATES IN THE JUDICIAL BRANCH

"SEC. 6. (a) The first sentence of section 521 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'plus (A) 14 per centum of his rate of compensation (including the additions thereto resulting from the application of the foregoing percentages), or (B) \$250 per annum, whichever is the greater, except that such rate of compensation shall not be increased by more than 25 per centum'.

"(b) The second sentence of such section 521 is amended to read as follows: 'The limitations of \$6,500 and \$7,500 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the eighth paragraph under the head 'Miscellaneous Items of Expense' in The Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1946 (Public Law Numbered 61, Seventy-ninth Congress), or in any subsequent appropriation Act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this section, and the changes in the rates of basic compensation in the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, made by section 405 of this Act and section 2 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall not be taken into account in fixing salaries under any such appropriation Act.'

"(c) Section 522 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION IN LIEU OF OVERTIME

"SEC. 522. (a) Each officer and employee of the Supreme Court of the United States entitled to the benefits of section 521 of this Act shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 10 per centum of the rate of his basic compensation. As used in this subsection the term "basic compensation" includes the additional basic compensation provided by section 521 of this Act.

"(b) The additional compensation provided by subsection (a) of this section shall be considered a part of the basic compensation of any such officer or employee for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended."

"LIMITATION ON AGGREGATE RATE PAYABLE

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting after the words 'by reason of the enactment of this Act' the words 'or any amendment thereto.'

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no officer or employee shall, by reason of the enactment of this Act, be paid with respect to any pay period, basic compensation, or basic compensation plus any additional compensation provided by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, at a rate in excess of \$10,000 per annum.

"VESSEL EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 8. (a) Section 102 (d) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) This Act, except sections 606 and 607, shall not apply to employees of the Transportation Corps of the Army of the United States on vessels operated by the United States, to vessel employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to vessel employees of the Department of the Interior, or to vessel employees of the Panama Railroad Company."

"(b) Section 606 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"VESSEL EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 606. Employees of the Transportation Corps of the Army of the United States on vessels operated by the United States, vessel employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, vessel employees of the Department of the Interior, and vessel employees of the Panama Railroad Company, may be compensated in accordance with the wage practices of the maritime industry."

"COMPENSATORY TIME OFF FOR IRREGULAR OR OCCASIONAL OVERTIME WORK

"SEC. 9. Section 202 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by striking out 'forty-eight hours' and inserting in lieu thereof 'forty hours'."

"NIGHT PAY DIFFERENTIAL

"SEC. 10. That part of section 301 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 which precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows: 'Any officer or employee to whom this title applies who is assigned to a regularly scheduled tour of duty, any part of which, including overtime, falls between the hours of 6 o'clock postmeridian and 6 o'clock antemeridian, shall, for duty between such hours, excluding periods when he is in a leave status, be paid compensation at a rate 10 per centum in excess of his rate of basic compensation for duty between other hours:'."

"PAY FOR HOLIDAY WORK

"SEC. 11. That part of the first sentence of section 302 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 which precedes the proviso is amended to read as follows: 'Any officer or employee to whom this title applies who is assigned to duty on a holiday designated by Federal statute or Executive order during

hours which fall within his basic administrative workweek of forty hours shall be compensated for not to exceed eight hours of such duty, excluding periods when he is in a leave status, in lieu of his regular rate of basic compensation for such duty, at the rate of twice such regular rate of basic compensation, in addition to any extra compensation for night duty provided by section 301 of this Act:'."

"PAY RATES FOR GRADES 9 AND 10 OF THE CRAFTS, PROTECTIVE, AND CUSTODIAL SERVICE OF THE CLASSIFICATION ACT

"SEC. 12. (a) Section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the second paragraph relating to grade 9 of the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Service and substituting therefor the following:

"The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$2,870, \$2,980, \$3,090, \$3,200, \$3,310, \$3,420, and \$3,530."

"(b) Section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the second paragraph relating to grade 10 of the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Service and substituting therefor the following:

"The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$3,200, \$3,310, \$3,420, \$3,530, \$3,640, \$3,750, and \$3,860."

"(c) With respect to grades 9 and 10 of the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Service, the increase in rates of basic compensation provided by section 2 of this Act shall be computed on the rates of basic compensation established for such grades, as amended by subsections (a) and (b) of this section."

"GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

"SEC. 13. This Act and any other general legislation heretofore or hereafter enacted governing the employment, compensation, emoluments, and status of officers and employees of the United States shall apply to officers and employees of the General Accounting Office in the same manner and to the same extent as if such officers and employees were in or under the executive branch of the Government."

"PERSONNEL CEILINGS

"SEC. 14. (a) Section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) (1) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (b) of this section—

"(A) with respect to the departments (other than the Department of War and the Department of the Navy), establishments, and agencies (including Government-owned or controlled corporations) in the executive branch, the Director shall so determine the numbers of full-time civilian employees and the man-months of part-time employment on the basis of the relative needs of such departments, establishments, and agencies for personnel, that the aggregate number of such civilian employees (including the full-time equivalent of man-months of part-time employment) shall not exceed (i) five hundred and twenty-eight thousand nine hundred and seventy-five for the quarter beginning October 1, 1946; (ii) five hundred and one thousand seven hundred and seventy-one for the quarter beginning January 1, 1947; (iii) four hundred and seventy-four thousand five hundred and sixty-seven for the quarter beginning April 1, 1947; and (iv) four hundred and forty-seven thousand three hundred and sixty-three after June 30, 1947;

"(B) with respect to the Department of War and the Department of the Navy, the Director shall so determine the numbers of civilian employees (including the full-time equivalent of man-months of part-time employment) that at the earliest date practicable, but in no event later than July 1, 1947, the number shall not exceed one hundred and seventy-six thousand with respect to the De-

partment of War, or one hundred thousand with respect to the Department of the Navy."

The numbers of employees specified in this paragraph shall be regarded as maximum numbers, and nothing herein shall be construed to limit the authority of the Director to establish lower aggregate numbers whenever, in his opinion, the numbers so specified are in excess of those necessary for the proper and efficient exercise of the authorized functions of the departments, establishments, and agencies to which this subsection applies. The procedural provisions of subsection (b) of this section shall be applicable with respect to determinations under this paragraph.

"(2) No provision of law heretofore or hereafter enacted authorizing the employment of personnel by, or appropriating funds for the compensation of personnel of, or conferring additional functions upon, any department, establishment, or agency, shall be construed to authorize the employment of, or payment of compensation to, a greater number of employees subject to this subsection than the number so determined by the Director with respect to such department, establishment, or agency unless such provision of law specifically authorizes the employment or payment of salaries of personnel in excess of such number, or exempts such department, establishment, or agency from the provisions of this subsection, and any such employment or payment not so authorized shall be deemed to be a violation of the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 31, sec. 685).

"(3) The provisions of this subsection shall not apply with respect to employees whose basic compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose. The provisions of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department or to officers and employees of the Veterans' Administration, but shall apply with respect to officers and employees outside the United States whose compensation is fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and who are not excluded from the provisions of this section by the provisions of subsection (f). The provisions of subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to officers and employees outside the several States and the District of Columbia."

"(b) Effective October 1, 1946, subsection (f) of such section is amended by striking out '(1) employees of the War and Navy Departments except those who are subject to the provisions of titles II and III of this Act; or (2)'."

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 16. This Act, except section 14 (b), shall take effect on July 1, 1946."

And the House agree to the same.

That the title of the bill be amended to read as follows: "An Act to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes."

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
EDWARD H. REES,
JOHN W. BYRNES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
HARRY BYRD,
B. B. HICKENLOOPER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment to the text of the bill strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

Except for the differences noted in the following statement, the conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

INCREASE IN RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION

The House amendment increases the rate of basic compensation of each officer and employee in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government to whom the amendment applies by \$400 per annum over his present rate. The Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 increased each of the rates of basic compensation contained in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923 on June 30, 1945, by 20 percent of that part thereof which is not in excess of \$1,200 per annum, plus 10 percent of that part thereof which is in excess of \$1,200 but not in excess of \$4,600, plus 5 percent of that part thereof which is in excess of \$4,600. The Senate amendment strikes out such rates of increase and substitutes therefor 36, 18, and 9 percent, respectively. The conference substitute provides for an increase of 14 percent or \$250 per annum, whichever is greater, over the present rate of basic compensation of each officer and employee in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government to whom the substitute applies, except that any such rate of compensation shall not be increased by more than 25 percent.

As compared with the conference substitute providing an over-all average increase of 14.2 percent, the House amendment increases the basic compensation of each officer and employee at an average rate of 17.1 percent. The Senate bill provides an average increase of 11 percent over the present rates.

Except for the operation of the provisions of section 14 (a), discussed hereafter, relative annual costs of such increases in basic compensation of officers and employees in the executive branch as of June 30, 1946, computed on the basis of 970,647 employees, are shown by the following figures: House amendment \$388,300,000; Senate bill \$248,500,000; and the conference substitute \$321,700,000.

Under the operation of section 14 (a), the cost of the conference substitute would be reduced by approximately 75 percent for the fiscal year 1947, so far as the executive branch is concerned, outside of the War and Navy Departments.

The annual cost of increases in basic compensation in the legislative and judicial branches and the District of Columbia government under the conference substitute would be approximately \$4,700,000.

Subsections (b) and (c) of section 4 of the House amendment are not contained in the conference substitute. Subsection (b) was in the bill as reported to the House and subsection (c) was added on the floor of the House. The purpose of these subsections was to extend the benefits of the bill to heads of departments and agencies, including the

Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Chairman of the Advisory Board of the Inland Waterways Corporation. This was consistent with the policy of the bill as reported to the House, since such bill repealed the salary ceiling of \$10,000 per annum established by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945. The House, after adopting subsection (c), restored the \$10,000 ceiling on salaries, but these subsections remained in the bill as passed by the House. Since heads of departments and agencies receive salaries of \$10,000 per annum or more these subsections are meaningless and are therefore omitted from the conference substitute.

JUDICIAL BRANCH

Section 521 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 increased the limitations of \$6,500 and \$7,500 upon the salaries of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges contained in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1946, by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by such section. Since these limitations are being repeated in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1947, the conference substitute adds language to the second sentence of section 521 which also increases the same limitations in the 1947 Appropriation Act and in any subsequent appropriation act.

Section 6 of the House amendment repealed section 522 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 which authorized, until June 30, 1947, additional compensation, in lieu of overtime pay, at the rate of 10 percent on not to exceed \$2,900 of salary, for officers and employees in the judicial branch. The conference substitute is in agreement with the House amendment in this respect, except that it provides that additional compensation in lieu of overtime pay shall be paid, on a permanent basis, to officers and employees of the Supreme Court of the United States, at the rate of 10 percent of their aggregate salary, and that such additional compensation shall be regarded as a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

PERSONNEL CEILINGS

The House amendment contains a proviso in section 14 which states that, except in the case of the Veterans' Administration, no greater amount shall be appropriated to any executive department or agency for salaries for the fiscal year 1947 than the amount made available for such purpose for the fiscal year 1946. The purpose of this proviso is, of course, to absorb the cost of the increases in compensation granted by the bill to employees in the executive branch by reducing the number of such employees.

It would be a practical impossibility to separate from the service as of the close of business on June 30, 1946, the entire number of employees necessary to absorb the cost of such increases. Moreover, if the separations were averaged throughout the fiscal year 1947, twice the number of employees would have to be discharged to accomplish this purpose. This would result in reducing total personnel to a point which would absorb twice the cost of the increases in compensation for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, and would seriously endanger the ability of the executive departments and agencies to perform the functions imposed upon them by acts of Congress. Also, evidence presented to the conferees led to the conclusion that a limitation based solely upon the amount of funds appropriated or expended for personal services during the fiscal year 1947 would be impracticable to administer and would result in inequities in application. On the other hand, it is apparent that the number of personnel in the executive branch can be substantially reduced without affecting the proper and efficient exercise of the authorized functions of the executive branch,

The conference substitute provides a plan requiring the absorption of a major part of the pay increases through a gradual reduction of personnel during the fiscal year 1947. Such substitute amends section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, which imposes upon the Director of the Bureau of the Budget the duty of establishing quarterly personnel ceilings, by adding a new subsection (g) requiring the Director in establishing such ceilings to determine the number of employees in the executive branch (except employees of the War and Navy Departments and employees referred to in the following paragraph) so that the aggregate number will not exceed 523,975 for the quarter beginning October 1, 1946, 501,771 for the quarter beginning January 1, 1947, 474,567 for the quarter beginning April 1, 1947, and 447,363 after June 30, 1947. If these limitations on employment are adhered to, there will result a saving during the fiscal year 1947 with respect to the employees affected of approximately 75 percent of the cost of the increases in compensation granted by this bill and an absorption of more than the entire cost of the increases for succeeding fiscal years. At the same time the number of employees will not be reduced to as low a figure as would be the case if the total cost of the increases were absorbed during the fiscal year 1947. The number of employees stipulated for each quarter is based on an initial estimate of 556,173 on June 30, 1946, and on the assumption that the reductions to meet the respective ceilings will take place gradually throughout the preceding quarter. In view of the existing uncertainty as to the personnel requirements of the War and Navy Departments during the course of the fiscal year 1947, such departments are not required to meet ceilings quarterly, but the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is required to effect a reduction so that at the earliest practicable date, but in no event later than July 1, 1947, the number of civilian personnel will not exceed 176,000 in the War Department and 100,000 in the Navy Department.

The employees of the Veterans' Administration, employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, employees of the government of the District of Columbia, and employees whose basic compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, are exempted from the ceilings fixed by this subsection, but employees, other than those of the War and Navy Departments, outside the United States whose compensation is fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, and who are not excluded from the provisions of section 607 by subsection (f) of such section, are included. With respect to the War and Navy Departments, only employees in the several States and the District of Columbia are included in the ceilings.

Subsection (g) also provides that any employment of, or payment of compensation to, a greater number of employees than the number determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to any department, establishment, or agency, under authority of such subsection shall be deemed to be a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (the antideficiency law) unless a provision of law specifically authorizes the employment of, or payment of salaries to, personnel in excess of the number determined by the Director, or exempts such department, establishment, or agency from the provisions of such subsection.

Section 607 (f) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 excluded from the authority of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to establish quarterly personnel ceilings, until the cessation of hostilities in World War II as proclaimed by the President, wage-schedule or prevailing-rate employees of the

War and Navy Departments, who were not subject to titles II and III of that act. Section 14 (b) of the conference substitute brings these employees under the Director's authority in this respect, effective October 1, 1946.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
EDWARD H. REES,
JOHN W. BYRNES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate first gave attention to legislation to bring about an increase in pay of Federal employees. Later the House acted in that direction, and the two measures were sent to conference. There were 9 conferees, 5 on the part of the House and 4 on the part of the other body. The conferees held 12 sessions.

I desire at this time to express my personal appreciation as chairman of the House committee of conference to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

There were many points of difference between the two approaches in the Senate and House versions. Our task was a difficult one. There was an example, by the House members of the conference committee, of patience and a desire to thoroughly go into all of the points at issue. I think it is important for me to say to my colleagues that under the House bill the cost of providing increases was approximately \$388,300,000. The cost under the terms of the Senate bill was \$248,500,000. The conference substitute has set the figure at \$321,700,000. That, of course, is a figure considerably under the amount in the original bill and also very materially in excess of that contained in the Senate measure. I feel that it is important to say also to the membership that other than the rates of pay we had a very difficult task, and I use the word advisedly, of working on an amendment which would contain the essence and spirit of the amendment passed in the House bill as offered by the gentleman from Illinois, Representative DIRKSEN. The House conferees tried very painstakingly to carry out the will of the House on that matter.

I report to my colleagues that the cost under the conference substitute would be reduced by approximately 75 percent for the fiscal year 1947 as far as the executive branch of the government is concerned, outside of the exemptions which we have placed for the War and Navy Departments. So even though we are bringing in a pay increase bill for Federal workers, this conference committee, composed of Democrats and Republicans, understood full well the intent and the action of the House on the Dirksen amendment.

I believe this is the first pay raise measure brought to the House where its cost, or a large portion thereof, is absorbed by a reduction in Federal personnel. We have attempted to put that desirable end into workable language so that there may

be a reduction in the number of employees within the structure of our Federal Government. So we have done, as we believe, a two-pronged job. We have brought about a compromise of the rate of pay, but we have done as best we could what we felt the House would want in connection with a justifiable increase. But coupled with that responsibility we have not forgotten and have not turned aside from the direction of the House in reference to the necessity for an orderly and needed reduction of the employees within the Federal Government.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What will the total annual cost be of the increases involved in this measure plus the previous increases that were given to Federal employees?

Mr. RANDOLPH. In answer to the gentleman, the cost under the conference substitute would be \$321,700,000 annually. The cost under the bill as it passed the House would have been \$388,300,000. In other words, we have reduced the cost under the original bill by sixty-six or sixty-seven million dollars. We have increased the cost under the original Senate bill as reported in the conference from \$248,500,000 to this figure that I have just presented.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. When was the last raise given Federal employees?

Mr. RANDOLPH. In 1945 there was an upward pay adjustment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What did that amount to? Does the gentleman remember?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I cannot give the exact figure.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I am unable to give the exact figure, but I would say that the \$321,000,000 cost of the proposed measure is absorbed by a reduction in the number of employees. That is, 75 percent of the \$321,000,000 must be absorbed by a reduction in employees on or before July 1, 1947, and after July 1, 1947, the balance of 25 percent is entirely absorbed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the confirmation of my earlier statement about the absorption of the cost.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But the gentleman does not remember what the total amounted to in 1945?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed two additional minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself three additional minutes. I desire to accommodate other Members who want to speak.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In numbers, what does this decrease of 75 percent of the cost provided in this bill represent?

Mr. RANDOLPH. From 2,400,000 to 1,600,000 within this period, to July 1947.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is 700,000 or 800,000?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That would be approximately 800,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Then, this bill carries less increase by fifty or more million dollars than the bill which was passed by the House?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And that is not taking into consideration the decrease in the number of employees?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; we were simply working on the conference substitute. The figures I have given you deal with what we have done in compromise study between the Senate and the House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. How is the reduction in the number of employees to be handled? Will each department go through and say, "You reduce a certain number of employees"? Who eventually makes the decision on who will have to be dismissed? How will that be worked out by the departments?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. The reduction is worked by an over-all ceiling. That is, instead of being frozen in departments there is a top, over-all freeze for the entire Federal service. Then the Bureau of the Budget must make adjustments within the various agencies and departments of the Government.

Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There may be some departments within the Government which cannot have a reduction without seriously affecting the efficiency of that department.

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We have provided a so-called escape clause, where a justification for additional employees can be made. I am certain the conferees were cognizant of the point made by the gentleman, because that was brought forcefully to our attention.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman mentioned \$331,700,000 as compared with \$500,000,000 under the Senate bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; the Senate bill was \$248,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Then this is an increase over the Senate?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; from \$248,500,000 to \$321,700,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Does that \$331,700,000 mean an additional annual expense to the Treasury?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. Affecting how many employees?

Mr. RANDOLPH. We based it upon 970,647. That is the computation.

Mr. STEFAN. Nine hundred and seventy thousand six hundred and forty-seven?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Understand, those other figures I gave of 2,400,000 took in all categories of Government.

Mr. STEFAN. This, of course, does not affect the nonclassified employees.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; and then we have made certain other exemptions.

Mr. STEFAN. Then the reduction regarding which my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska interrogated the gentleman from West Virginia refers only to the 970,647 employees; not to the other employees of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish first to express my appreciation to the chairman of my committee [Mr. RANDOLPH] for the fairness with which he has handled this legislation both on the floor of the House as well as in the committee. I also want to thank the members of the subcommittee for the very cordial treatment I received at their hands during the hearings and during the presentation of this legislation on the floor of the House. We did spend considerable time deliberating with respect to this legislation, and on many occasions we did not fully agree. At all times I was accorded full and free discussion. When the bill originally reported was presented on the floor of the House, I was the only member of my committee who came to the floor and expressed opposition to the legislation by filing a minority report. I did not think the legislation was what the House wanted, what the country wanted, or that it was really fair to Government employees generally. That legislation, if you will recall, provided 18½ percent over all for everybody under the classified service, even lifting the ceilings above \$10,000. The House, as you know, adopted an amendment striking out the 18½-percent provision and substituted \$400 across the board for everybody. With that having been adopted by the House, the measure went to conference with a far different version adopted in the other body. The bill passed by the other body provided for increases on a percentage basis, 36 percent on the first \$1,200, then an increase of 18 percent to \$4,600, and 9 percent beyond that.

I submitted a proposal to the House when the bill was considered here that I thought was more nearly fair than any other proposal that had been offered. The House at that time did not really get to vote on my proposal. Generally speaking, my proposal provided considerably larger increases for those in the lower brackets and not so much for those in the higher brackets.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation embodied in this conference report is not entirely satisfactory to me. It is, of course, a compromise that was reached after several days of discussion among members of the conference committee.

I still contend, as I did when the legislation was presented to the House, that more consideration should have been given to the thousands of employees in lower-paid groups. It was contended by the majority of the membership of the conference committee, that the percentage of increase should be the same all

the way across the board. In fact, the legislation proposed in the first instance by the House committee, provided increases entirely on a percentage basis. So, even under that bill, an employee who now receives \$1,440 per year would have had an increase of less than \$300, but if he were an \$8,000 employee, he would get an increase of \$2,400. Under the proposal I submitted, at that time, those in lower brackets would receive increases beginning at a rate of more than 20 percent on their present pay rates and percentage would go lower as salaries go higher. Lower percentage increases would apply in the higher brackets.

I am not opposed to fair increases to those in the higher grades, but I still contend that since this legislation is based upon the increased cost of living it should be more equitably distributed. There is not the wide difference in the cost of living as indicated in this report.

This legislation increases the salaries in the lower groups about \$20 per month. In the top groups, it is more than five times that amount. It is inequitable, but appears to be the best agreement that could be reached under the circumstances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, this bill provides for an increase of 14.3 percent in total cost. The additional three-tenths percent is due to the increases in the lower brackets. If I had my way about it I would have increased those people even more and would not have increased those in the higher brackets so much as provided in the legislation. That is my own personal view.

Mr. Speaker, we did have considerable discussion with respect to ceilings on personnel. An amendment was submitted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the so-called Dirksen amendment, which provided in substance that increases in cost must be absorbed by a reduction in personnel. My own recommendation was, I thought, a realistic one and would have reduced the number of personnel right down the line. We have a sort of combination in here. We have put a sort of ceiling on personnel in various departments of government, then we have attempted to limit the cost to the amount now being spent for Federal employment. It is a sort of notice that Congress is in favor of personnel reductions. It must not, in any event, be construed as a "floor" of employment in any case.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to another thing. We do not have much control over the number of personnel in the Government. This is a thing I would like to go on and discuss at some length, but I will not take the time now. We have a Civil Service Commission with quite a staff and organization. We also have a Bureau of the Budget to which these various agencies of government go and tell how much money they will need. The Bureau of the Budget ap-

proves the amount of money requested. The matter then goes to the Appropriations Committee.

The Appropriations Committee listens to the testimony of the heads of the agencies, who, in most instances, are interested in building cases of their own, and very, very rarely even suggest voluntarily they can get along with a lesser number of employees. It is almost pathetic to observe that little is done with respect to control of personnel in any of our departments of government. I have tried to call the attention of the membership of this House many times to the need for an agency to deal with personnel in government. I have legislation pending on the subject which, if enacted into law, would, in my judgment, reduce personnel very materially and make for better and more efficient government, and at the same time save hundreds of thousands of dollars to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, who has watched and studied this problem very closely.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Do you retain the \$10,000 maximum?

Mr. REES of Kansas. We do; yes. That was an amendment I submitted when the legislation was considered in the House.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Under this new bill, is the increase 14.3 percent across the board?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No. It is 14 percent across the board with the exceptions I mentioned. The extra three-tenths percent over-all cost comes about because of increases in the lower brackets. I mean those who would not get the minimum of \$250 if they were not included in that particular minimum.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Those in the lower brackets get an increase of 14 percent or more?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct; and at least \$250 increase. I thought the minimum should be somewhat more and those at the top should be less.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Then some in the higher brackets are limited to 14 percent?

Mr. REES of Kansas. All others are limited to 14-percent increases.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. On this matter of decreasing the personnel, I thought I got a very clear statement from our colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], that the reduction between now and next July would be 75 percent, and then in July 1947, we would absorb the other 25 percent, taking up this additional increase provided for in this bill. Now, as a matter of figures, how many persons will be taken off the roll under this provision?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The aggregate number on July 1, outside of the Navy and the Army, is contemplated to be 528,975, then 501,771 for the quarter beginning January 1, 1947, and 447,363 on June 30, 1947, a year from now. That is outside the Army and Navy.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As a total proposition, how many people will

it be necessary to remove from the rolls to absorb this increase of \$331,000,000 that we are granting in this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. We are dealing now, of course, with those in the classified service only, and after January 1 there should be a reduction of approximately something over 400,000. Outside the Army and Navy. Maybe I am wrong about that figure.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I got the impression from the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] that this would accomplish a decrease in personnel of around approximately 800,000.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, that observation is correct, in the over-all employment of the Federal Government.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In the over-all employment of the Federal Government, including the Army and the Navy, that figure would be increased according to testimony submitted by about 400,000 more.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman mean that no one will get this increase except those in the classified service?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Do the 2,400,000 individuals get the increase or only those in the classified service?

Mr. REES of Kansas. This bill deals with those in the classified service.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How can you get this reduction of 800,000 if you are only dealing in the first instance with 900,000 plus?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The reason for that is that it is contemplated by the various departments of Government that they will have a reduction by that time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. My question was to the effect that through the provisions of this bill itself there would be a reduction effectuated that would absorb this \$331,000,000 increase, or approximately that, and the gentleman from West Virginia said that that would represent about 800,000. I am somewhat confused on these figures.

Mr. REES of Kansas. You have to add to that the Army and the Navy, which is estimated at approximately 400,000.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Army and the Navy are included, sir. That is the over-all reduction. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that there is a reduction anticipated of 800,000 over-all, and that includes the War and the Navy Departments.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We hope the gentleman may be correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I suggest that the gentleman from Kentucky read the report. All of the information is contained on the bottom of page 10 of the report. It places a ceiling on the Army and the Navy. The War Department will have 176,000 employees maximum on July 1, 1947, and the Navy 100,000 on July 1, 1947.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I just wanted to get it clear that this legisla-

tion is designed or intended to effectuate a decrease in the civil personnel of the Government of around 800,000. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is about 471,000 outside the Army and Navy, about 100,000 in the Navy, and about 176,000 in the War Department.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I agree with the gentleman from Kansas. I think his original idea of giving a greater amount to the lower-paid employees is good. However, I intend to vote for the conference report.

In this conference report do you anticipate the need of some agencies, like the Veterans' Administration and others, to increase their personnel? Has that been taken care of?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That should have been explained. The Veterans' Administration is not under these ceilings, for it is an expanding agency. It is difficult now to estimate its needs. So it is left out as far as ceilings are concerned. It is a special exception.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In view of the fact that labor groups and the public groups have been taken care of, does not the gentleman, coming from an agricultural State, think the farmers should have the benefit of the Case bill, which would give them parity for their products?

Mr. REES of Kansas. We are not discussing the Case bill now, but in answer to the gentleman may I say that the farmers are just as much entitled to an increase in their income as any other group in the country. I do appreciate the gentleman's interest in the farmers of this country. Incidentally, the farmers are going to have a time in attempting to meet the goals set for them.

One thing that has been emphasized by reason of these conference discussions, is the need for dealing with the question of Government employment in a realistic and businesslike manner. No agency is held responsible for the number of employees in Government. There is no over-all control responsible with regard to efficiency or overlapping, duplication of activities, or waste in Government agencies.

Consideration of this legislation has also emphasized the need of a very careful and constructive study of the entire pay structure of Federal Government, with a view of attempting, at least, to provide equitable payment for services rendered. More credit and encouragement should be given to employees because of their efficiency and industry. For example, an administrator ought to receive more pay because he is able to get along with less people, rather than under present conditions, where his pay is increased because he has a larger group employed under his supervision, whether he needs them or not.

Our Government employment has become very much of a "hodge" sort of affair, and certainly needs straightening out. We need an agency or organization

responsible to Congress, that will at all times keep its hands on the situation in an effort not only to determine the number of employees needed, but to suggest ways and means by which improvement may be made in Government employment. That phase is very much neglected.

On numerous occasions, as I said at the beginning of this discussion, I have called attention to the membership of this House, to the overstaffing of many departments of our Government and that little consideration is being given by any of our agencies with respect to reductions in force. Here we are at the present time with twice as many employees on the pay roll as we had in 1940, even though the war has been over in Europe for more than a year. We are paying as much for Government employment at the present time as our entire appropriations amounted to only a comparatively few years ago. That sort of thing just cannot be continued very long. The cost of Federal employment alone is approximately \$3,000,000,000 annually, or an average of \$120 for every family in the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I shall support this conference report. It is a simple measure of justice to carry out the policy of the Government already established in industrial wages, for it is an increase in order to meet the higher cost of living. I have felt, however, that it would have been fairer, as long as this is, so to speak, a bread-and-butter bill, if we had had a larger increase for the lower-paid employees and a smaller increase for the higher-paid employees. However, I do think the House Committee on the Civil Service and the committee of conference have done an earnest and sincere job and have reached the best conclusion they could in bringing together the conflicting views of all of us. I congratulate them upon it, and shall certainly support the conference report as it is now written.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the very outset and within the compass of a limited time, let me pay testimony to the restraint and to the fairness and to the tolerance and to the grace of the House conferees on this committee of conference. I doubt whether men can sit around a table for 12 conferences with legislation that is so difficult and so knotty and so tricky and bring forth a sweet fruit unless they bring the utmost of patience and restraint to the task. The conferees have certainly done so. They have been generous with me with respect to what has been known as the Dirksen amendment, which found its way into this bill originally about 5:30 in the afternoon when the measure was on the floor before us for the first time. Obviously, the original language is scarcely identifiable, and I can readily understand why this is so. I was under no misapprehension at the outset that it would not require revision. But with

the restrictive limitations under which we operate we cannot always include in an amendment the refinements that are so essential to make it feasible and workable. But the principle was established in that amendment and roundly adopted, and from the very outset the conferees were mindful of the determination of the House to bring about a reduction in personnel in the Federal Government. You may recall that the amendment in its original form was in the nature of a limitation to provide that the salary increase should be offset by a sufficient reduction in force to offset the amount of money involved. They have achieved that objective for the fiscal year 1947, and probably ran just a little beyond that time. But they will finally achieve the objective of saving that money so that hundreds of millions of dollars are involved.

I want to make sure that one or two figures are included in my remarks. The first one is this: That at the very top or peak of Federal personnel, in August of 1945, we had the unbelievable and astonishing total of 3,649,769 people on the Federal rolls, inside and outside of the United States of America. Now contrast that with the rolls of December 1932, when the number was 563,805. In December 1939, before we moved very deeply into the war momentum, we had 928,836. Before we got through, we had at least four times that number of people in 1945. We get a better appreciation of it perhaps in terms of dollars. At the peak in 1944, the annual salary expenditure of the Federal Government was \$7,500,000,000. So for salaries alone in 1944 we were expending an amount which was twice the total amount of appropriations for all Federal purposes when I came to Congress in 1933. I made the point in the course of my remarks earlier that some rather heroic measure was necessary to bring about a diminution in personnel and nowhere is that so amply demonstrated as it is in the case of the war agencies that we have been trying to liquidate. As a matter of fact, only one emergency agency has actually been liquidated, and that is the Office of Censorship. Five others have been transferred either in whole or in part and their functions have been preserved and transferred to other agencies of the Government. Three others are still doing business but their titles have been changed and their functions have been modified somewhat by Executive order. That involves some 67,000 people. So the committee of conference has done a good job and this will count for a diminution of some 100,000 people eventually from the rolls by July 1947, in comparison with the over-all ceiling personnel that was sent to us by the Budget Bureau, with the consent and, of course, with the affirmation of the President of the United States. They estimated at that time roughly about 1,710,000 as of July 1, 1947. Under this plan, there will be 1,611,120. So I think the House should salute the committee of conference for a difficult job very well done.

Permit me to add this final word. Section 14 of the conference bill establishes an over-all personnel ceiling of

1,611,120 as of July 1, 1947, compared to a total of 1,710,000 which the President approved in the Budget estimates which were submitted to the Congress early this year. The personnel amendment as finally revised will require a reduction in the classified service from 528,975 on October 1, 1946, to 437,363 persons on June 30, 1947.

In addition a ceiling is established on civilian personnel for the War Department of 176,000 and 100,000 for the Navy Department.

A suitable escape clause has been provided in the case of any agency which might be burdened with additional duties and finds itself in the position of being short on personnel. In such cases Congress can specifically authorize an increase over the ceiling or such an agency can be exempted. But in any case the authority lies with the Congress and I am confident now that we have made a concrete advance by bringing about the reduction of an additional 100,000 persons on the Federal rolls and that additional progress can be made in the months that lie ahead. It is, indeed, a happy start.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, in the passage of this Federal pay bill today, which has had long consideration before the Civil Service Committee and much consideration between the conferees of the House and Senate, I am glad to inform the House that for the first time the Congress has been able to make a successful move to deflate bureaucracy.

As a member of the Civil Service Committee for 3 years along with the gentleman from Kansas, Congressman REES, and others of that committee, we have realized the necessity of Congress being given the authority to continuously investigate Government agencies in an effort to get greater efficiency and in an effort to prevent padding of Government pay rolls.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago we of the minority tried to put through a resolution to set up an agency in the Congress to bring about greater efficiency and economy and thereby to make it possible to demobilize and deflate bureaucracy. Our efforts were not successful in the committee.

A year ago an investigation was made under the supervision of the Civil Service Committee, which by a vote by the members of the committee, was never allowed to come to the floor of the House, and may I say the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], myself, and others, exerted our best efforts to bring this committee report to the House.

It showed conditions prevailing in the Federal agencies here that were costing the taxpayers probably billions of dollars due to inefficiency and unnecessary employees.

The amendment incorporated into this bill placing a ceiling on Federal employees will, within the next fiscal year, save the Government by a reduction in force about \$300,000,000 which otherwise would not have been saved except for the placing of these ceilings.

I am quite sure that the taxpayers generally will applaud the efforts of the members of the Civil Service Committee and of the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman DIRKSEN, who aided the members of the committee in support of the amendment he introduced which will bring about the results I have pointed out.

This bill makes it possible for a reduction in force without impairing Government service. It confirms the view of us on the committee who have stated time and again that the executive department of the Government has not and will not reduce the Federal pay roll.

I hope this first step taken by the Congress will be followed by others in an effort to get the greatest efficiency in Government with the least number of people employed on the Federal pay roll.

This will make it possible for those who render faithful service to receive higher wages at the hands of the Congress.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want again to say what I said earlier. I pay a deserved tribute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

I believe also very firmly in an orderly reduction of the employees of the Federal Government. I also feel my last remark must be this: That the Government of the United States, through its employees of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches, is carried on by a devoted and capable group of workers. We must not forget that today when we give them a partial recognition for their services.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think it ought to be understood that these ceilings we have been discussing today can in no wise be interpreted as putting a floor on the number of Federal personnel.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed 1 hour, that it be confined to the bill, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6429, the legislative branch appropriation bill, 1947, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] is recognized.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for several years I have served as chairman of the legislative branch appropriation bill. Each year I have explained the operations of the various functions under the bill. In this presentation I will not attempt to go into detail as I have done in the past, because I presume those facts are known to the membership of the House.

The legislative pay bill, which is before you, is the smallest appropriation bill that we have. It is a most pleasant committee on which to serve. There has been the greatest harmony between both sides of the aisle in the consideration of the bill.

I regret very much that the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. NOBLE JOHNSON, was not able to be with us. All of you know he was in a very serious automobile accident. We have missed him very much on the committee, with his helpful advice and the study which he gives to the appropriations. I understand he is improving rapidly, and in that we all rejoice.

The other members of the committee have been quite faithful, and I believe we have brought to you a bill which should be very satisfactory to all Members of the House.

We have had the same careful assistance in the preparation of the bill from our clerk, Mr. Orescan, as we have had in the past. The report which he has written is very full as to the important matters in the bill.

This year we have appropriated \$52,899,000 in this bill. This compares with \$55,437,000 for last year. We have a decrease over the operation of last year of \$2,537,000.

The Budget presentation to the committee was \$58,339,000. We allowed \$52,899,000, or a decrease of \$5,439,000.

I should like to call this to the attention of the Members, that although this is called the legislative appropriation bill, in reality we appropriate considerable sums of money for activities that are in no way connected with the legislative branch of Government. Of the \$52,899,000 appropriated in this bill the sum of \$25,575,000 is for activities which cannot be considered a part of the legislative branch of the Government. The point I wish to make is that it costs to run

this third branch of the Federal Government, the great legislative branch, only \$26,323,000; that all in this bill that is properly chargeable to the legislative department, the House of Representatives, the Senate, and all the activities of the legislative department, is a total of \$26,323,000. Why, Mr. Chairman, we have little items in the Agriculture bill, Interior bill, and a number of others that come before the House that will exceed the total amount of money required for the legislative branch. Certainly there is a very practical attitude of economy on the part of the legislative branch to be able to operate for the sum of \$26,000,000 as a total cost to the taxpayers of this country.

We made very little change in the House of Representatives' expenditures, a few minor changes here and there in a position, a salary increase to someone on the pay roll whose pay has been too little in the past, but all of it has been of a very minor character.

I wish to call to the attention of the membership the fact that we have here the most peculiar situation as far as the salary set-up in Congress is concerned, both on the House side and the Senate side. No very thorough study has been made as to a comparison between similar jobs on the two sides and what they should bring in the way of salary. The result is that throughout the House of Representatives pay roll you will find men who are getting, some perhaps too much and some too little, but the minute you raise one you throw others out of adjustment. So the answer to the problem as this committee saw it was to suggest to the Accounts Committee to make a thorough study of the salary set-up of every employee in the House of Representatives, to try to find those who are underpaid and who, if any, are overpaid, and to ask the Senate to make the same kind of study, then to get together and adjust the salary item so that a man on either side of the Capitol will be getting approximately the same pay for the same type of work. We have not attempted, therefore, to take care of every deserving man on the pay roll but we hope that during the next year the matter will be worked out.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice on page 31 of the bill, lines 7 and 8, for telegraph and telephone service, exclusive of personal services, \$300,000. I realize we have had telephone service before, but is this an additional item for telephones?

Mr. O'NEAL. It is exactly the same as it was last year. There has been no increase.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is there any provision for telephone service to Members of the House?

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, that would be the telephone service for the building rather than long distance.

Mr. O'NEAL. To make it very clear, there is no increase for telephone service as far as the membership is concerned. There is nothing in the bill which gives any individual Member the right to tele-

phone at Government expense. There never has been. The public generally thinks there is, but there is not.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe the other body does have some provision as to telephones.

Mr. O'NEAL. I am not informed as to the situation in the other body other than to know they have some provision for long-distance calls.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I know we are appropriating for it in the bill. I also know that the other body has appropriations for sound-scriber service which the House does not have. It seems to me that we in the House ought to be just as liberal with the House Members as they are in the other body.

Mr. O'NEAL. I may say to the gentleman that I have no criticism of the other body in this respect. We do not attempt to interfere with the other body in how it arranges its affairs and that body does not attempt to interfere with the way we handle our affairs. I think it should be that way. They may have some things over there not accorded to the membership over here. We have some things over here not accorded to the membership over there. We have not attempted to touch any Senate items in this bill, and we do not believe the Senate will attempt to touch any item in the House bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. In reference to the matter of telephone calls, which is no affair of the House, I think about \$300 a year is allowed each Senator.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does that include snuff and water?

Mr. RABAUT. I do not know about the snuff part of it.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it is well to clarify that a little more. Unless there has been a change in this year's bill, the telephone call arrangement for the Senate last year averaged about \$1,800 per Member. It should be emphasized again that when extra telephone service is put in a Member's office in the House he pays the monthly cost of that, and I refer to those Members who may have been compelled to put in an extra phone. If a Member makes a long distance call he pay for it himself.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. PLOESER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEAL. So far as our committee is concerned we are willing to let the Senate attend to its affairs. The Senate has always reciprocated in this attitude.

Mr. Chairman, the Architect of the Capitol is provided for in this legislative bill. We have continued that operation practically as it was during the past year. We have allowed a little money for a few improvements, possibly where a roof is going bad or for similarly urgent matters. Nothing has been provided for major improvements except in the power plant

which is in very bad repair. We did allow an appreciable amount of money for the improvement of that power plant and also for the increased cost of coal.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I notice on page 30, lines 14 and 15, there is a provision for \$400,000 as expenses of special and select committees.

Mr. O'NEAL. Those are the special and select committees of the House and this is the amount of money they require to operate the committees, such as post-war economic policy and planning, post-war military policy, food and meat investigation, and others.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is what I was trying to find out.

Mr. O'NEAL. We have authorized many special and select committees. Those committees have to be appropriated for and they come out of this particular appropriation bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is the amount practically the same as it has been?

Mr. O'NEAL. It changes from year to year. I may say that sometimes there is a lot of that money appropriated for special committees returned where the committee does not use the full amount.

Mr. Chairman, another item appropriated for in this bill is the Government Printing Office, one of the greatest institutions of its kind in the world. In 1945 they did a \$75,000,000 business down there. This establishment is rather unique in Government operation in that, so far as I know, that large business has no supervision by the legislative or any other branch of Government with reference to its operation. This is not said as a criticism, because they have a remarkably well-run plant. The Government Printing Office does all the printing for the various bureaus, they bill the bureaus for the cost of the printing, and the bureaus reimburse the Government Printing Office. The General Accounting Office sees that the bills and the receipts balance. So far as I have been able to discover, there is no board over the management down there to advise or go into any question arising at the Government Printing Office. The head of the Printing Office, the Public Printer, runs the whole thing the way that he wants to run it. As I say, it is no criticism, because I think he has been a very able executive. It is run with practically no supervision from anyone else.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice on page 38 there is an item for legislative garage, \$20,500. Is that legislative garage available to the Members of the House?

Mr. O'NEAL. The so-called Senate garage over here has a certain number of stalls where you can park your car. Space is given to Senate Members as well as House Members, although I do not believe there are enough stalls probably to take care of the entire membership of both bodies. The usual custom

has been to put your name on the list, and as time goes on you get yours. The new Members probably cannot be taken care of, but as time goes on they will get theirs. That is the operating expense.

All we do in this bill for the Printing Office is to appropriate \$20,000,000 as their working fund. Of course, that is returned to the Treasury at the end of 1 year, but we make that appropriation. Then we appropriate for just that part of the printing that is done for the House of Representatives and the Senate. It amounts to something over \$4,000,000. So this appropriation carries a revolving fund of \$20,000,000, plus \$4,000,000 for the printing that is done for Congress. You will find in the report a complete statement as to what that printing is.

The other big item in the bill is the Library. I will not attempt to describe the entire work of the Library, but I want to take just two or three minutes. The Congressional Library was started as a Library for the Congress. The purpose of the Congressional Library was to be a workable library for the legislative branch of the Government. We have probably the most remarkable library in the world. All of us should be very proud of it. I think the management of it under Dr. Evans has been very good, indeed. That is my personal opinion. They have now a library which is second to none in the world and probably the greatest library in the world. But in this bill, if you will notice the report, we took a tremendous amount of money away from them, or at least, from the request that they made. The reason for it was this: This Library has grown so much and is in such great demand that it has become instead of a Congressional Library a national library or even an international library. If we want that kind of a library, of course, we will have to appropriate for it. If we are going to furnish library services for the United States and then attempt to gather the books and information needed in a library of this sort from all parts of the world, we are thinking in terms of a library such as we have never had before. Therefore this committee took the position that as a legislative appropriations committee it was hardly within our province to appropriate money for that type of library without some expression from Congress, or from the proper committee stating that Congress wants that type of library. We made these cuts without prejudice, but we do believe some committee of the House should determine whether or not we want to have a library of that kind. This is certainly not an attempt to speak against it, because the Library is furnishing marvelous service all over the United States, and we can be very well proud of it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. On the last page there is a provision relating to persons who advocate the overthrow of the Government, and so forth. I notice in the press that the other body in one of two bills inserted a provision that no Federal employee who subscribed to striking against the Government should be employed. I wonder if the committee has given any thought to writing into this appropriation bill a similar provision.

Mr. O'NEAL. This provision carried in this appropriation is the standard clause which was put in all of the appropriation bills a few years ago and which has been carried as a standard provision. We did not give any consideration to re-writing some clause such as the gentleman has in mind relating to any un-American activity or un-American belief.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Striking against the Government, and things of that kind.

Mr. O'NEAL. We believe that a proposition of that sort should not be decided by some appropriations subcommittee. It should be a policy of Congress. If Congress adopts it, then it can be carried in the individual bills just as this provision is carried in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

As chairman of the committee, I would be very glad to answer any questions, but the report is very complete, you have had long experience with the bureaus covered under this bill, and I imagine you know the story without the chairman of the committee going into it any further.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Starting back a good many years ago I have indulged myself in some thoughts about the Botanic Garden, and about once in 3 or 4 years I have addressed an inquiry to the Member in charge of this legislative bill to ascertain why the Congress should support a botanic garden. I have suggested many times in the past that such an institution might well be transferred to a more appropriate executive department of the Government. I remember quite well, if the gentleman will be patient with me, years and years ago when men were giants, if the wife of a Congressman wanted to give a reception in Washington, rubber plants could be borrowed from the Botanic Garden to decorate her house. That was considered a high privilege in a democracy. I understand that privilege has been abandoned. Consequently, I am wondering why the Botanic Garden should remain under the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. O'NEAL. I may say to the gentleman that this question has been asked several times. The Botanic Garden has been a tradition, and I think it is perpetuated probably because it is a tradition. I doubt that it could be very well justified as a matter of logic. It has been there a long time, and many people feel that the work could not be done properly by the Department of Agriculture, that it is a specialty. It has just been continued. I cannot give the logic for it. I can say that some of the work done by the Botanic Garden has been most interesting and most helpful. It is a very delightful, may I call it, avocation of the Federal Government. Whether or not I can justify it from a logical standpoint I have grave doubts.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I see in the report that the appropriation provided in this bill for the Botanic Garden is \$134,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. It is a very remarkable organization.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is a rather costly tradition, as the gentleman called it.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman will be amazed at the work they are doing and what they have done in this country in the development of their specialty and the type of thing they have been working on. Although you can speak of it rather lightly, I think if you will go into it you will find that much of what they have done has been of a very worth-while and remarkable character.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] for his fairness in conducting our hearings, and for the very fine statement which he has just made covering the entire bill.

It is regrettable that the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], was not able to be with us during the hearings, due to his and Mrs. Johnson's meeting with an automobile accident in Pennsylvania several weeks ago. We understand that both he and his wife are well on the road to recovery, and we trust that our colleague will be with us real soon.

The legislative subcommittee, as a result of the hearings, carefully looked into the condition of our national economy when writing this bill. The actual potential power in matters of appropriations and public finance is with Congress, and when Congress expresses its will, that will should be, and is expected to be controlling.

I wondered as I listened to the witnesses who came before our committee seeking appropriations, if some of them ever gave a thought to our national economic unity, or whether they were just a little bit on the side of "what does it matter." It was surprising to me to have presented to us the most unusual requests of the Congressional Library, especially as to their plans for a 10-year program, which, it seems to me, is more than an experiment.

If that is the way the Library of Congress is to operate, we would do well to look into the subject very watchfully. No one has convinced me yet that such a program should creep into that great institution. I want more information about it. Of course, our committee did not approve all the justifications of the Library. It is utterly reckless to gamble the purse strings of the Nation upon the correctness of any set of theories springing purely from hypothetical motives. Without the use of vision by those in authority in the Congressional Library this great institution will be in for a complete change. It may come sooner than we think. We are entitled, from time to time, to have the true facts confronting the Library and its personnel.

The people of this country are paying in the aggregate, a large sum of money to maintain the Library of Congress, and they are deserving of great service and a fair and impartial administration.

I desire, at this time, to quote from the committee report:

The reasons for the reductions effected by the committee in the various items under this general head are: (a) the desire of the committee to reduce all Federal expenditures to an absolute minimum and, (b) to give attention to the need for a determination as to what the policy of the Library of Congress is going to be in the way of expansion and the service to the public and to the Congress. The original purpose in establishing the Library was to serve the Congress; however, it would seem that the Library has evolved into not only a Congressional Library but a national and even an international library. It is believed that the responsibility for determining Library policy rests with legislative committees of the Congress charged with the responsibility for operation of the Library and not with the Appropriations Committee whose responsibility it is to appropriate for projects and activities duly authorized by the Congress. If it is the desire to build and maintain the largest library in the world which, according to testimony, the Library of Congress is at present, that is one matter, and if it should be the policy to maintain a library primarily for the service of the Congress, it is quite another matter from the standpoint of fiscal needs. The reductions in the amounts are made without prejudice and the committee will in the future be obliged to take similar action until such time as a definite library policy is established.

There is a happy medium in everything, and real results are usually obtained through the recognition that there is an obligation resting upon all public servants to do their duty and to do it well.

During the war years, people all over the land were hoping that with the end of hostilities every effort would be made to balance the Budget. Now that we are seeking peace throughout the world, what assistance are we getting from the bureaucratic set-up in Washington to prevent inflation? If our financial structure is to be governed by a sound economy, we must discontinue to appropriate vast sums of money, unless such appropriations are for the general welfare of all our people.

It is my judgment that the electorate throughout our country will demand that Congress desist from granting funds to bureaus which are in excess of the amounts actually required to carry on the functions of the agencies. We can correct the conditions with which we are confronted now, even though the questions involved are difficult and disturbing.

The time has long passed for us to face the issue fairly and squarely. Otherwise, the wrath of those whom we have the honor to represent will be upon us very soon.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIBBOTT. I yield.

Mr. NORBLAD. On page 14 there is an appropriation for \$4,000 for the purchase, exchange, driving maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Vice President of the United States. As we have no Vice President, I was curious

to know what the purpose of that provision is.

Mr. TIBBOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is in the Senate part of the bill. It has nothing to do with the House.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to propound a question to the majority leader. In the past few days he has professed to be disturbed about Russia's foreign policy. I, therefore, urge him to tell the House why American tax and bond dollars should continue to UNRRA, where they are in turn largely used to strengthen Russia and Russian-dominated areas. Is not his party again breeding war as it did in the case of Japan?

When this administration provides foreign nations with great quantities of durable-goods supplies, is it not furnishing them with the tools of aggression and war?

To the end of March two Russian states had received about 200,000 tons of supplies from UNRRA alone. Russian-dominated countries had received a million tons of supplies.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the majority leader will discuss this problem frankly with the House. America's future is in danger today at home. Why? In part because the people see this Government stripping us of resources to fuel both Russian and British imperialism in Europe and Asia.

In frantic efforts of the people to protect themselves against this war-breeding and inflationary policy, America is being turned into an economic battleground of dog eat dog and the devil take the hindmost. This internal threat can only be stopped by a reversal of this irresponsible foreign hand-out policy.

Twofold constructive action is needed. Other than possibly famine-relief foods, all American supplies to Russia and Russian-controlled areas should cease until peace is achieved, and the British-loan scheme should be abandoned because of the rising tide of trouble that scheme is breeding among the people of America.

Like all true Americans, I am desperately anxious to see America help bind up the war wounds of the world—to the limit of our capacity. But such supplies should not be promised beyond our capacity. And our efforts abroad should go directly to help human beings, not to enable rival imperialisms to expand and/or to preserve despotism over suffering peoples.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, clerical assistance to Senators, \$1,646,640: *Provided*, That all clerks, assistant clerks, and additional clerks, under this

heading shall be ex officio clerks, assistant clerks, and additional clerks of any committee of which their Senator is chairman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to suggest the attention of the House to a bill, a copy of which I hope each Member will get, namely, Senate 2177, introduced by Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, which embodies the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress. We are dealing today, of course, only with the appropriation needs of both the House and the Senate and those instrumentalities which come under legislative jurisdiction, but I very respectfully suggest that you will find a great deal of interest in Senate 2177, because it deals with a great variety of subject matter.

For instance, it deals with the reconstruction of the whole committee structure in the Senate. Obviously, the so-called streamlining job for House committees had to be left out of this bill. It is a matter which must engage the attention of the House when the bill comes over here.

There is quite a little material dealing with congressional procedure, legislative and standing committees, and so forth, also improvement of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and then a very important section dealing with majority and minority policy committees and a joint legislative and executive council.

In part 2 the bill contains provisions which would be applicable to both Houses and this includes such matter as dealing with private bills, joint hearings, decisions on questions of committee jurisdiction, estimates of receipts and expenditures, hearings and reports by appropriations committees, and other items.

Part 1 of title II of the bill relates to congressional personnel and makes recommendations which are designed to develop a stenographic pool, increase the staffs of committees, improve and strengthen the Legislative Reference Service, expansion of the office of the Legislative Counsel, studies by the Comptroller General, and above all a very important section which deals with the subject of reductions in appropriations.

Part 2 of title II deals with improvement of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the establishment of a joint committee on printing and on the library.

You will recall that we heard much about the need for the enactment of a Federal statute dealing with lobbyists. Title III of this bill is devoted to this whole subject and deals fully and completely with the regulation of lobbying.

Every Member knows how much time must be devoted to the introduction and processing of bills dealing with private claims. May I point out to you that title IV of the Legislative Reorganization Act is a complete treatment of the whole claims procedure and is designed not only to facilitate the processing of claims but to save time.

You may be intrigued by title V which is entitled "General Bridge Act." Every Member of Congress who lives close to a watercourse and who has a

navigable stream running through his district has at one time and another concerned himself with the introduction of bills authorizing the construction of a bridge across such a stream. Title V of this bill is designed to place that responsibility in the War Department.

As I pointed out earlier, title VI relates to compensation and retirement pay for Members of Congress, and title VII is devoted to self-government for the District of Columbia by means of the establishment of a charter commission in the District of Columbia whose duties and responsibility it would be to prepare a charter which would provide a form of municipal government in the Nation's capital.

The bill is 88 pages in length. It is extremely well drawn and I do hope that Members will take the trouble to familiarize themselves with the content at an early date.

In addition, let me suggest to your attention a matter in which I am confident everybody is interested, that is compensation and retirement pay for Members of Congress. You will find the details in sections 601 and 602 of the bill. It recommends that both House and Senate Members' salaries should be increased from \$10,000 to \$15,000, and that an actuarial retirement system be set up for those who have served 6 years or more and reached age 62, and are then retired in one manner or another. They would be entitled to retirement pay at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent of the base salary times the number of years' service with a limitation of 75 percent of the base salary. Thus retirement pay for any Member serving the greatest length of time would be 75 percent of \$15,000.

We had a retirement measure which engrossed the attention of the House not so long ago. Certain features were left out because we did not want to be at cross purposes with the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Congressional Organization. So all these matters are now embodied in a single bill, S. 2177, and I express the hope as a member of the joint committee that in the not too distant future the Senate will have acted on the bill and it will come to the House for consideration.

May I also say that recently the Senate set up a special committee under Senate Resolution 260, consisting of six Senators who were members of the Committee on Organization that had the unanimous support of the Rules Committee in the Senate, and they are now functioning as a committee that is authorized to report and to handle the legislation; and I am confident that under the devotion and diligence that have been given to it that the same course will be pursued in the House when it comes our turn to consider the legislation. This is a matter in which I have had a deep personal interest and have over a long period of time. I express the hope that before the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourns sine die there will be action on this important bill.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HENRY. Will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois venture a sug-

gestion as to what committee in the House will have jurisdiction of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The bill contains such varied subject matter that if the ordinary rule were to be followed it would be referred probably to several committees. The same situation obtained in the Senate and for that reason the Senate looked with favor upon the creation of a special committee for the handling of these recommendations in toto so that they would not be dismembered and parceled out and distributed to possibly half a dozen different committees. I hope a similar procedure may obtain in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT]. I noticed that he propounded a question to the majority leader. I did not want the RECORD to go unchallenged. I want the RECORD to show that both the minority and majority leaders are absent from the floor, I presume on official business; and I did not want the RECORD to look as though the question had been propounded and not answered. That is the reason for my taking the floor at this time.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. As a practical matter, of course, I did not expect the majority leader to answer the question this afternoon. I simply wanted to get it before him in such a way that if he cares to he will answer the question. It should be answered and I think the people should have an answer to the question.

Mr. HOOK. I did not want the RECORD to indicate that he was present and did not answer the question.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

For the preparation, under the direction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives of the statements for the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, showing appropriations made, indefinite appropriations, and contracts authorized, together with a chronological history of the regular appropriation bills, as required by law, \$4,000, to be paid to the persons designated by the chairmen of such committees to do the work.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question. Referring to page 18, line 16, the item "For mileage and expense allowance," \$1,260,000. Will the gentleman tell me what constitutes that item?

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman will recall that there was \$2,500 appropriated and made permanent law in the Legislative Pay Act of last year for expenses and allowances. Presuming that all of the Members and Delegates take it, the gentleman can figure what the total would be. In addition to that, there is the mileage of the Members of Congress that would come out of that. The total of those two is \$1,260,000.

CONGRESSIONAL PAY AND CAMPAIGN PROMISES

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on this extremely interesting, perplexing, and somewhat embarrassing subject of how much we think we are worth and whether we think we are worth what has been voted, we each have our own views. I did not vote for the expense allowance. I accepted it after it became the law. I would be quite willing to vote for higher salaries for the next Congress and then let the voters decide who shall be in the next higher-paid Congress.

But it is not my purpose in speaking at this time to force my views on congressional compensation upon the House. I want to call the attention of my colleagues to another phase of this matter that may come up. Possibly in the heat of debate, or in the heat of a campaign, some Member of Congress, or some candidate for Congress, may make some campaign promise to his constituents that if he is elected he will not accept the full compensation provided by law for Members of Congress.

I want to call the attention of the Congress to the fact that it has been decided by the courts that such a promise is a corrupt practice which may invalidate the election of the candidate making the promise.

The general law on this is stated in volume 106, American Law Reports, page 474:

Offers made and statements published by candidates for a public office that they will, if elected, serve at less salaries or for less fees than those fixed by law, are a violation of a Corrupt Practice Act making it a corrupt practice for any person to give or offer money or other valuable thing to an elector to induce him to vote for any candidate at an election.

The annotation of cases under this heading include decisions by the courts of Montana, Ohio, South Dakota, Kentucky, Iowa, New York, Indiana, Wisconsin, New Hampshire, Missouri, and Kansas.

The leading case in Ohio, *Prentiss v. Dittmer* (93 O. S. 314), was decided 30 years ago. We studied it in law school. This case held—

An offer by a candidate for common pleas judge, made for the purpose of effecting his election to office, that in the event of his election he will accept for his judicial services only the stipulated salary payable by the State, and that he will accept nothing that may be due and payable to him from the local or county treasury, is against public policy and an offense within the purview of section 5175-26, General Code, which, if proven, invalidates his election.

In this case the candidate, in his campaign literature, promised not to accept part of his salary. He was elected, but the Supreme Court held his election invalidated by his promise. Judge Jones, in the course of the opinion, said:

It is but little less reprehensible that, for the purpose of inducing election, he should promise to refund to the community as a whole that portion of the salary he should receive from the county than to offer to contribute to the taxpayers individually their pro tanto proportion of the amount of salary forgiven. In the latter event the taxpayer is required to pay less

taxes, irrespective of the personal fitness of the candidate.

There is a wide difference between a promise of this character and those multifarious pledges made by candidates in the interest of reform, economy, and a rigid and effective administration of office in compliance with their official oaths. The latter are made in the public interest and are consistent with personal fitness; the former savors of vicious tendencies, involving a personal pecuniary consideration offered by the candidate in order to accomplish his election, in which the test of fitness is not an element.

In the *State, ex rel. Bill v. Elting* (29 Kans. 397), a keen analysis of promises of this character, made for the purpose of inducing election, was made by Judge Brewer, afterwards a member of the Supreme Court of the United States. He said:

The theory of popular government is that the most worthy should hold the offices. Personal fitness—and in that is included moral character, intellectual ability, social standing, habits of life, and political convictions—is the single test which the law will recognize. That which throws other considerations into the scale, and to that extent tends to weaken the power of personal fitness, should not be tolerated. It tends to turn away the thought of the voter from the one question which should be paramount in his mind when he deposits his ballot. It is in spirit at least, bribery, more insidious, and therefore more dangerous, than the grosser form of directly offering money to the voter.

I simply took this opportunity to call attention to these decisions, and to say to my colleagues that while each of us, and our opponents, should discuss this subject as our consciences dictates, I hope that no Member, through ignorance of the law, will make a promise to refuse to accept compensation which is due him by virtue of the office to which he is elected, because if he makes such a promise he will in all probability be violating the Corrupt Practices Act of his State and possibly of the Federal Government, and may be subject to the penalties connected with such violation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am going to tell another telephone story. In doing so, I would like to pay tribute to the Capitol telephone operator who got the call through so quickly for me.

I received news from Lowell that a little child 5 years old was lost in the White Mountains. I got the telephone operator to call the Coast Artillery at Portland, Maine. It seemed only a second before she got the call through for me and I heard General Terry's voice. I asked that he send a detachment of men to the White Mountains to make a search for the little girl who was only 5 years old.

He said, "Mrs. ROGERS, I am afraid the troops are rolling out for maneuvers, but I will see what I can do."

He came back and said he had detained them and instead of rolling off just for ordinary maneuvers they were on their way to the White Mountains. With

their help, the child was found alive after 8 days in those mountains.

In that instance you see what the telephone did for constituents. I could cite literally hundreds, and I should say thousands, of cases where invaluable aid was given as a result of long-distance telephone to a constituent or a constituency. A Congressman must pay for those telephone calls out of his own pocket and for many of the telegrams.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

Salaries: To enable the Librarian of Congress to employ competent persons to gather, classify, and make available, in translations, indexes, digests, compilations, and bulletins, and otherwise, data for or bearing upon legislation, and to render such data serviceable to Congress, and committees and Members thereof, and for printing and binding the digests of public general bills, miscellaneous printing, supplies and materials, and including not to exceed \$20,000 for employees engaged on piecework and work by the day or hour at rates to be fixed by the Librarian, \$400,000, of which \$5,700 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That not more than \$25,000 of this sum shall be used for preparation and reproduction of copies of the Digest of General Public Bills.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 43, line 4, strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$234,034."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment so we may carry only the amount that was carried for this current year for the Legislative Reference Service. I have done this because, while I recognize that the digest they get out is useful, a lot of their other service is of a character that most of the Members cannot satisfactorily use. In other words, when they are asked to investigate a subject, they send in to Members—and I have had complaints of that repeatedly—only one side of the subject. On top of that, every time I have tried to use them they have been utterly worthless. Under these circumstances I have crossed them off my list and forgotten about them because I have felt that they were no good. I have found that in order to get anywhere I had to go out and dig the thing up myself. I am sorry they are running that kind of service over here and for that reason I cannot go along with it.

Frankly, I was disappointed to have shown to me today an announcement of a corporation indicating that it had a group of Bryan productions, motion pictures, including a number of items of propaganda for Soviet Russia. I see on the back page of the bulletin a memorandum stating that "All inquiries on the subject with reference to certain items should be addressed to Mr. Luther Evans, Librarian of Congress." The implication went out that this outfit was connected with the Library of Congress. I deprecate that fact. I deprecate the fact also that this same fellow who is putting out this particular type of propaganda has items over in the Library

that the Librarian is putting out. That does not bear directly upon this pending appropriation. I would be willing to go just as far as any man in the House on anything that is of real service to the membership, but when it comes in such a way that you cannot get the kind of service that one who desires to make a fair approach to a problem wants, then I do not believe it is meeting the requirements it should so far as the Library of Congress and the Legislative Reference Service are concerned. In my opinion, we ought to hold them to the \$234,034 that they had for the current fiscal year.

I hope my amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York merely puts the Legislative Reference Service back to the amount it had last year. This is certainly not a partisan matter because last year we had 20 or 25 Members of Congress come before our committee with the request that the Legislative Service be expanded. It undoubtedly has possibilities of being what we most need; that is, some place, somewhere where an expert may be found who will represent the Congress and do the research work that is so necessary for us. That is the theory behind it.

We have had suggestions and bills, as you know, that each Member of Congress be given a research clerk. It involves a tremendous amount of money for each Member to have a five or ten thousand dollar clerk in his office. It was further suggested that we implement the committees of Congress by having two, three, or four research men connected with every committee of the Congress. That is hardly practical or reasonable, which I think can be demonstrated.

The question is, How can we best get for the Members of Congress the type of study and research work that is necessary properly to inform us?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I have frequently used the service of the Legislative Reference Bureau. I am not always satisfied with the work it does but I do not believe that enters into the question here at all. We have to look at the question, What is the financial condition of the Government at the present time? That is what we ought to look at. If we can afford an increase, I am willing to go along, but the fact is we just simply cannot afford it. I am willing to forego, as far as I am concerned, the services over there if that is needed to bring our financial house in order.

Mr. O'NEAL. Let me answer the gentleman. I thoroughly sympathize with the gentleman's willingness to forego and to sacrifice in order to save money and to help balance the Budget. Frankly, most of the members of this committee have given a great many

years of their life to try to cut down expenses. One of the things most needed by the Appropriations Committee is a method of finding out intelligently where we can apply cuts. The Appropriations Committee has some experts, they go down to the bureaus and do a pretty good job in finding where money can be saved; but there is no money that will save money so intelligently as that to provide people who are competent to go into the bureaus, to go into fundamental questions as to whether a certain work is needed or not. That is, real research men who can say that money is wasted or say that it only takes 10 men instead of 20.

I believe that it would be economy in the long run if you could have a Legislative Reference Service properly manned. It will show you ways to save hundreds of times what its personnel is paid. I sincerely agree and believe that economy is absolutely essential, and if I spend \$100,000 to save \$10, that is not economy.

On this present proposition the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress has recommended the Legislative Reference Service as the place wherein congressional research should be done. They also recommended, after a thorough study, that we give them \$750,000 a year. Now that is the proposal—and I think some of the members on this joint committee are certainly economy minded—that we give them \$750,000. We did not do that. We did not give them what the Members of Congress said they should have, but we did put in the bill the sum of \$400,000, and with that they can provide the experts that we have now and also add other high-type men at \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year, who could earn much more if they were in private industry. There are some subjects which we need to have investigated; social service, and many other things that I could mention. They are all outlined in our hearings. We will have men of outstanding ability and experience to assist us.

The gentleman from New York has suggested this cut. It is not what most of the Members, I think, on both sides, want, and I believe that we can ill afford not to build up the strongest research department that this country needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The greatest contribution that the Congress of the United States can make toward economy in government is efficiency of operation in Congress, so that the Congress knows what it is legislating about and is able to meet the challenge of what some of us call a well-entrenched bureaucracy; is that not correct?

Mr. O'NEAL. Absolutely.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have had the experience, as a member of one or two investigating committees, where the membership of the committee would work diligently on the investigation, and we would find that perhaps 30 or 40 lawyers had been assigned by a department to the task of refuting the different bits of information that we would bring out and attempt to substantiate the things that were being done by this agency of government, and the Congress has been very weak in that particular phase of its work, and therefore I believe it is needed.

I would like to ask the gentleman one question, however. I notice the item of miscellaneous expenditures. Does this bill provide any funds for the purchase of needed office equipment? I am thinking of typewriters and things like that that are worn out.

Mr. O'NEAL. We have been unable to get typewriters, but there is an additional sum of money in the bill for typewriters and an appreciable sum of money for a program of replacing rugs that are in such terrible condition in the Old House Office Building. Those amounts are greater than they were last year. I think with the amount provided they can do a satisfactory job in replacing the rugs in the Old House Office Building.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The average Member of Congress has had his office staff working with worn-out equipment all during the war because we were unable to obtain the equipment we needed, and we did not want to take it for our own use when this equipment was needed for the war effort. But the time has now come when we must replace that equipment if we are going to have efficient operation in our own offices, and that is the reason I made the inquiry.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman is very correct about that. The typewriter situation is almost an emergency proposition in many of the offices, because the typewriters are not in good condition, and they must be replaced.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Right along the line of the observation of the gentleman from Ohio, the thought entered my mind that the War Assets Administration might have some typewriters.

Mr. O'NEAL. The matter is being gone into, I may say to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. If so, that should be followed up.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I make one other observation, and I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts will agree with me. I have had some 30 years of experience in public work, especially around legislative bodies. It has been my experience that the legislative branches of the Government, whether national or in the States, have always been rather free in expenditures for the executive agencies and have always been extremely frugal in making expenditures for their own benefit. I think it is about time that we make Congress over into an

effective and efficient agency of the people.

Mr. O'NEAL. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio that he is very correct. The unfortunate part is that the legislative branch has to appropriate money for the executive and the judicial branches, but nobody can appropriate money for the legislative branch but the legislative branch itself. Therefore, it appears to be a personal proposition always. We are reluctant to do it for ourselves when we do not hesitate to do the same thing, and probably in many cases for much less worthy reasons, for the executive and the judicial branches. But when it comes to an appropriation for the legislative, nobody in the world can make it but the legislative branch itself. Therefore, in many cases it is not done, through an overweening modesty, in my opinion.

Mr. FLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. FLOESER. At the present time I think each Member is restricted to three typewriters in his office. Is there any change in that restriction?

Mr. O'NEAL. There is no change of any kind. I believe when typewriters are available if a man can demonstrate a need something can be worked out so that he can be provided with that which he needs.

Mr. FLOESER. I think that should be done. Many of our offices cannot get along with what we have.

Mr. O'NEAL. In the testimony, if you will read it, we did attempt to get an unbiased opinion. We are attempting to get the advice of experts who are the equal of the experts of business interests who come before our committee, and also the experts of the bureaus who come here and ask funds of us. This is in no sense a partisan matter. It is just a question of whether the House believes the service rendered by the legislative reference service is worth having. Men on both sides of the aisle have come and requested us to give more, in fact, considerably more than we have allowed in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky indicated that there were Members of Congress who appeared in behalf of an increase for the Legislative Reference Service. I think he could, with good grace, say that the gentleman from Illinois, namely, me, is one of those who appeared in that connection.

Instead of reducing this, my regret is that it was not increased to the full estimate of \$500,000, instead of \$400,000, but I did not offer an amendment to that effect.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress went into this matter rather thoroughly and have recommended a staggered increase that starts with \$500,000 for the Legislative Reference Service in the fiscal year 1947, \$650,000 in 1948, and \$750,000 a year thereafter. After all, it is the only service we

have to depend on for reference service and for research work. Let us take a typical example.

They had over there in 1945 and 1946 an expert on taxation and fiscal policy, to which my good friend from Ohio referred; that is, the general field, in seeking to bring about a balanced Budget. In 1945 and 1946 our expert in the Legislative Reference Service, our expert—the congressional expert—consisted of one man who could devote one-half of his time to that job at \$3,800 a year, and another man who could devote one-half of his time at \$3,200 a year. That is the kind of niggardliness we have indulged in heretofore. But you do not see other agencies of the Government doing it.

Let us see what the Treasury of the United States has been doing about fiscal research. In the appropriation bill for 1945 we gave the Treasury \$169,000 for tax research. We gave them \$181,500 for the Division of Research and Statistics, and then we gave them another \$150,000 for the general counsel's office. So we gave the Treasury \$500,795 for fiscal research, whereas we depended on one man at \$3,800 a year for half of his time and another man for half of his time at \$3,200 a year. If we expect to get the facts on these rather abstruse, difficult, and important subjects, then we must have experts.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Is not the distinguished gentleman from New York a member of the subcommittee?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the gentleman mean on the Treasury and Post Office Subcommittee?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; he is.

We agreed to the conference report on the housing bill the other day which contained \$400,000,000 for subsidies. Are there any experts in the Library of Congress in the legislative research department who can advise Congress on housing? There is not a one—not one. Where shall we go for expert guidance and direction? There are two places you can go. We can go to private industry, for instance; and when we do, they say we become victims of a lobby. The other place we can go is to the National Housing Agency. When we go there, we go to the very people who come before the Congress for the authority and the funds to carry these programs into effect and it would be too much to expect that they would present their own case in an adverse light. They seek money and authority and our job is to evaluate and appraise those requests. They have a vested interest in spending not less money but more money. Now, is there any other place where the Congress can go, burdened and belabored as it is with all manner of detail and routine matters of economic, social, and political policy, than to its own establishment—the Library of Congress? Why should we not put a few experts in over there who can advise us?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Has the gentleman found any other disposition than the bureaucratic disposition in dealing with this outfit?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I have not, and that is my complaint. It should be under the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders if we are ever going to get any honest service.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the members of the committee that I believe I use the Library of Congress, and particularly the legislative research establishment, as much as any member, sometimes to such a degree that they must tell me that there will be a very substantial delay in transmitting the information in which I am interested because they do not have the people who can be assigned to that job. There are no experts there on national defense, on full employment, on veterans' affairs, on mines and mining, on conservation, and a great number of other things. This amount should have been \$500,000 instead of cutting it back to the level of 1946. I do hope the amendment will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRIBUTION OF PRINTED CARDS

Salaries and expenses: For the distribution of printed cards and other publications of the Library, including personal services, freight charges (not exceeding \$500), expressage, postage, traveling expenses connected with such distribution, expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the Librarian, and including not to exceed \$20,000 for employees engaged in piece work and work by the day or hour and for extra special services of regular employees at rates to be fixed by the Librarian; in all, \$314,200.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Unless the appropriation bill for the Coast Guard can be disposed of this afternoon, which I hope will be done, that bill will come up on Monday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say that the gentleman from New York said that he did not think it would be possible to take it up today?

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope the bill can be put through today. I understand it will not take long and it would be very helpful to me in making up the program for next week if that can be done. Of course, if it cannot, we will have to govern ourselves accordingly. Then, of course, that bill will be taken up Monday.

On account of the primaries, I am trying to get this programed with the maximum of consideration for those who have primaries coming up from week to week. For example, there is one on Tuesday, and then there is one on next Saturday. The following week we will have 2 days off. There is the House memorial service, and then Memorial Day itself. So there must be more or less of a light calendar that week. I

want to crowd in as much as I can. That is why I hope the Coast Guard appropriation bill can be passed today. In any event, if not, that will come up on Monday.

There is the Gwynne bill, and after that the Indian Claims Commission bill.

Of course, there will be the Consent Calendar on Monday and the Private Calendar on Tuesday.

Then, there is the Administrative Court bill.

Then, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization bill. Wednesday, Calendar Wednesday.

Thursday and Friday, the Navy Department appropriation bill for 1947.

I am unable to state whether we will sit on next Saturday or not. It will be a light day in any event. The chances are it will be dispensed with, but I am leaving it undetermined for the present time.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I would like to inquire with reference to the terminal-leave pay bill. That was supposed to be put down for next Thursday. I would like to ascertain as soon as possible when that will be taken up, as the Members want to be here when that is voted on. I have told them thus far that from statements made by the gentleman from Massachusetts it would be taken up possibly Thursday or Friday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not see how it can be brought up next week, because Saturday is the North Carolina primary. Six of the Members have contests. Some consideration must be had for that situation. Certainly, on the Florida primary, I took care of that, and I do not think we should make fish of one and fowl of another. I am just as much interested in the terminal-leave pay bill as anybody. I hope it can be passed by unanimous consent, but if there is a roll call on it, that bill is of such importance that every regard should be given to Members who have primaries.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I do not want to take any privilege away from anybody who has a primary, but I want them to be here. I wonder if I could get unanimous consent that immediately after the approval of the Journal on a week from next Monday this would be taken up.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to pass on that now. The chances are there would be a roll call on that bill. Of course, there is a great deal of interest in the matter. I will call it up just as soon as I can, but there are other considerations which the gentleman recognizes, I am sure. There is the Pennsylvania primary on Tuesday and the North Carolina primary on Saturday. The following week we have the House memorial exercises on Tuesday, and then Memorial Day itself. There are primaries on June 4 in California. That is a long distance away. It is difficult to program, and yet do the things we ought to do out of consideration for our colleagues.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I do not want to do anything that is not perfectly agreeable to the majority leader, but I

do hope we can get this bill up certainly week after next, if we cannot get it up next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman and I will discuss that, because I am just as anxious to get it taken care of as is the gentleman. But on Monday we have those two bills which are out over 7 days and Members have asked that they be taken up. That is compelling. Then, the administrative court bill and the other bill are on the calendar for Tuesday. I could not put it down for Monday, because the Members will be away on Tuesday. Then, when we come to Thursday, on a roll call, the Members will be away for Saturday.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am not asking for next Monday. I meant a week from Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that. But then comes the question of the California delegation, because they have to go a long distance. They have to go a long distance and their primary is on June 4. While that is 2 weeks from next Tuesday, nevertheless they have a long distance to go.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. June 4 is also the New Jersey primaries.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but in connection with the California primaries they must travel 3,000 miles.

I will be glad to talk to the gentleman from Florida as soon as I can. I think we ought to have regard for this situation and I know the gentleman from Florida has.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. And, by the way, I might also make the further observation that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and I have agreed and we hope the membership will support us that if there are any roll calls—I said yesterday that Wednesday would be the earliest; I did not definitely say Wednesday—but we have now agreed that if any roll calls should come on legislation considered before Wednesday, the roll call will be put over to Thursday. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is my understanding.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Not to exceed 10 positions in the Library of Congress may be exempt from the provisions of section 206 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1947, but the Librarian shall not make any appointment to any such position until he has ascertained that he cannot secure for such appointment a person in any of the three categories specified in such section 206 who possesses the special qualifications for the particular position and also otherwise meets the general requirements for employment in the Library of Congress.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of paying what I think is a well-deserved tribute to the services performed for Members of Congress by the Library of Congress as a whole and the Legislative Reference Service in particular.

I do not know how much other Members make use of the Library and its

services but I know that I make a great deal of use of it. There are many, many times when I need information on some subject when I refer that need to the Legislative Reference Service and sometimes within a matter of hours and other times a matter of a very short time I have the material I need. I do not know quite how we can efficiently conduct our offices without some such service as is performed by the Library. A Member of Congress is called upon to know at least a little bit about practically everything, and if he does his job correctly, he ought to know considerable about at least one or two things. If therefore he is going to keep up with the bills as they go through the House, especially if he is going to do any original work in the preparation of bills, if he is going to really have any background of knowledge about some of the complex problems that come before us, he has got to have the advantage of gathering together of information such as the Library can give. I recommend to Members who have not made a practice of doing so that when they get in trouble and need help they take up their problem with the Legislative Reference Service. Having said this I suppose I put myself in the position of making a promise that if it happens I will be the one to press the matter of securing sufficient funds to enable them adequately to do the work they will be called upon to do if we all make full use of the excellent facilities they afford.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. SAVAGE. Let me say to the gentleman from California that I am one Member of Congress who makes a great deal of use of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress. I have always had courteous treatment, prompt service, and they have always given me ample material, more usually than I needed.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate what the gentleman says.

Let me conclude by saying that I believe the man in charge of the Legislative Reference Service, Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, is one of the most useful public servants in the city of Washington.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. I was very much surprised at the remarks the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made. He gave us a very fine statement with regard to the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Library of Congress, but he stated there were only two men over there, one of them getting \$3,600 and the other \$3,200. I cannot understand how in the world those two men can give such wonderful service to the Members of Congress.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sure that is not a correct statement. In fact, I think I am acquainted with a good many more than that over there myself. It is true, however, and this should be said, that in many instances there are people in the Library who are the head of very important branches of research

work of the Library where the scale of pay is, in my judgment, quite inadequate to the degree of responsibility and the high level of requirements they need to do the job effectively.

I have not offered an amendment to the bill because I feel sure that the committee has considered all these things very maturely. I do believe it is most important, however, that consideration be given to this phase of the situation.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for recognition for the purpose of saying a word or two about the pending bill. Some years ago I was chairman of the subcommittee handling the legislative appropriation bill; in fact, I preceded the present distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], who has really done a great job.

This is called the housekeeping bill of Congress. It is one of the smallest appropriation bills that comes before this body for consideration. It is too bad that the people of the Nation do not make a study of the legislative appropriation bill, because if they did they would be surprised. As I said some years ago, there are three branches to our Government—the legislative, judicial, and executive. All of them have marched forward, particularly the executive department, in pace with the demands of the Nation.

The judiciary was in the horse-and-buggy age for a long time. We pulled it out somewhat lately. The legislative branch, as far as treating itself is concerned, is still in the horse-and-buggy age. Let us hope that some of the study that is being made for the purpose of bringing it up to date will really receive the attentive ear of the Congress. It really needs prodding from the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, particularly I want to pay tribute to my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee. I know him well. We came here together. We started our careers here in 1935, he from Kentucky and myself from Michigan. We have been close since coming here and, odd as it may seem, we were cast together on appropriations. As I said a moment ago, he was on the subcommittee on deficiencies ahead of me. He outranks me there, but I happen to outrank him in the chairmanship of this committee which he now heads. He is a hard-working, conscientious, thoroughgoing gentleman of the finest caliber, and there is not much more that can be said for anyone. He is thorough, he is painstaking, and he is devoted, and the entire Congress owes him a debt of gratitude for his devotion to the Congress. His devotion to the older Members of Congress is something that borders on what I cannot even describe. We know the conditions of many people who have left the Congress, who have served this Nation from every State in the Union, and find themselves forgotten when they leave. I could tell you stories of men defeated who have come back here pleading for an appointment in some bureau. The Nation does not ask this body to be so niggardly toward the membership, but the Congress by its own

indifference to its own welfare has brought such conditions upon its Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. May I call attention to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations, which really has supervision of the subject, does not even have sufficient money to hire a stenographer? It seems to me that is a pretty bad situation. With all the clerks and assistants necessary to develop appropriation bills and to assist the committee, they do not even have a stenographer or typist that you can put on the job. If that is not a sad state of affairs, I do not know what is.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is absolutely correct; and you could go on making citations of the things that should be done by Congress in order that Congress could better serve the Nation, which looks to it for its welfare.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What is the matter with the Committee on Appropriations here this afternoon making sufficient allowance to take care of a need that is so great? It seems to me it is ridiculous that we have to call on different departments of the Government to assist in the preparation of a bill, and we do not have a stenographer in the room. That is ridiculous, in my opinion.

Mr. RABAUT. There is a study being made; let us be patient and see what result the study will produce. Then Congress can act for the best interest of all.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]. The gentleman from Kentucky was about to yield to me when his time expired. The question I wanted to ask was whether in this bill allowance was made, as the gentleman from Missouri had just asked, for typewriters and tables and the office necessities that go with the increased work?

The gentleman will remember that in a previous appropriation bill, allowing additional clerical assistants, no allowance was made for typewriters and tables or the working tools to carry out the intent of that provision.

Mr. O'NEAL. I will say to the gentleman that the only reason typewriters were not previously included was due to the fact that on account of the war we could not get them. There is an increased allowance for typewriters in this bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. As well as other office equipment?

Mr. O'NEAL. Particularly for rugs for the Old House Office Building. Some

of them are disgraceful looking. Answering the gentleman further, there are other slight items of increase for office equipment and other things when we can get them.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is rather pointless to give the Members of Congress additional clerical help and not give the secretary a chair to sit on or a table to work at or a typewriter to use.

Mr. O'NEAL. This committee will proceed as rapidly as possible to provide the proper equipment for that purpose. That is the attitude of the committee. The reason the committee has not done so so far is because of the limitation of acquisition; in other words, you could not get the materials.

I am sure the committee is very much in sympathy with the gentleman's position that the poorest economy in the world is not to provide the tools with which to do the work we are called on to do.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman has said something with which I agree thoroughly, because that I think is the attitude of most of the people regarding much of the discussion this afternoon. The items of expense are very willingly approved by our constituencies as soon as they know the need.

As I said a moment ago, those of us who live in the far West have increased expenses. Our telephone and telegraph bills run in the neighborhood of \$50 to \$100 a month. I do not know when air-mail stamps are exhausted for eastern Members but ours are exhausted in August and sometimes in June or July.

Mr. O'NEAL. There is \$186,000 for typewriters, of which \$100,000 is to be made immediately available, in this bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. I can only ask the gentleman if the secretary is supposed to hold the typewriter in her lap while she is writing.

Mr. O'NEAL. As soon as those facilities can be provided, I assure the gentleman they will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

Salaries: For the Superintendent of Documents, assistant superintendent and other personal services in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and compensation of employees who shall be subject to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate and fix rates of pay for employees and officers of the Government Printing Office", approved June 7, 1924 (44 U. S. C. 40), \$1,300,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time because of the statement which has been made with reference to the Library. The pamphlet which was distributed disturbed me as it did the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Ohio, and others. It is difficult to understand a situation of that sort, but I believe that no man should be condemned without all the facts being known. I am sure that opinion is shared by the gentleman from New York and the others I mentioned.

Immediately I requested Dr. Evans to come over here, and the gentleman from

Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT] and I talked to him. He denied even knowing the corporation which put out the pamphlet. He denied knowing the man whose name was mentioned as president. He said his office might have had some correspondence but he did not know about it. He went back, and we asked him to look into it a little bit further and give us some information. He submitted a letter, which letter I am inserting in the record at this point.

(The letter referred to follows:)

THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1946.

The Honorable EMMET O'NEAL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. O'NEAL: I have before me a leaflet distributed by the International Film Foundation, Inc., of 1600 Broadway, New York City, bearing the date of May 1946, in which are listed for immediate distribution, or for distribution beginning July 1, eight films described as dealing with Poland and Russia. The leaflet says on the back page that inquiries concerning certain Government films should be addressed to me. The leaflet says further that the eight films on Poland and Russia "represent the initial offering of the International Film Foundation which was established late in 1945 by a grant from the Davella Mills Foundation."

While the time at my disposal has not permitted a complete search of the Library of Congress collection of motion picture films, a quick check indicates that not a single one of the eight films is in the Library's possession. The films are not known to Mr. John G. Bradley, director of our motion picture project, or to me. They have never been mentioned, so far as I can determine, in any correspondence carried on by an officer of the Library. They never have been and they are not now available through the Library of Congress. As far as I know, they are not available through any agency of the United States Government.

The statement given in the box on the bottom of the last page of the leaflet refers, as I understand it, to United States Government film. I believe that none of the films referred to as "the 23 South American films" is now in the collections of the Library of Congress, but it is almost certain that all of them will eventually be represented in our collections. The Library of Congress has been asked by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—and it has agreed, subject to the approval of Congress and the voting of appropriations for the purpose—to establish a distribution service on such Government nontheatrical motion picture film which may be transferred to it by the various agencies of the Government for this purpose. This distribution service might well include the afore-mentioned films produced for South American distribution. It is expected that any distribution of such films will be handled on an interlibrary loan basis as far as the number of copies made available to the Library of Congress by the agencies concerned makes that kind of service possible. Beyond this point, it is our plan to permit the making of reproductions of unrestricted films in our possession at the cost of the applicant. It would not be our policy to give an exclusive distribution privilege to anyone.

For your information, and in support of the statements given above, I am attaching the pages from the justification of the estimates which the Library of Congress prepared for presentation to your subcommittee at the hearings on April 22 and 23, a portion of which material is reproduced in the printed hearings (marked "Attachment A"). I am also attaching the file of correspondence

between the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and myself concerning the program for the Government film distribution service (marked "Attachment B"). Following this exchange of correspondence, the Library issued a press release dated March 4, 1946, a copy of which is also attached (marked "Attachment C").

I should like to give you, in addition to the above, the most explicit personal and official assurance that the Library of Congress does not expect to pervert any motion-picture program which may be approved by the Congress to any propaganda purpose, but intends rather to make such films as it distributes available on a system similar to that which has been used so successfully for a century and a half in making the book collections of the Library of Congress available to those who have a right to make use of them. I regret that the leaflet issued by the International Film Foundation, Inc., gives a plausible basis for a suspicion that our program is really something else. My colleagues and I have very little knowledge of the International Film Foundation, and have had no relations with it except of a routine character. I personally have very little knowledge of Mr. Julien Bryan and his activities. We have no knowledge whatever of the Davella Mills Foundation.

If I can give you further information, please feel free to call upon me for it.

Respectfully yours,

LUTHER H. EVANS,
Librarian of Congress.

Like others, I have heard things about Dr. Evans and I have heard the charges against him refuted, I have heard them denied. I believe he is a very competent administrator. I have more confidence in him, possibly, than do some of those who attacked him here today, but at least we can reserve judgment until we have an opportunity to know all the facts. My purpose in rising at this time is to state that it is my wish and my intention to insert in the RECORD a statement from Dr. Evans giving part of his reply.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, without amendment with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House without amendment with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial by David Lawrence, of the United States News.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult organizations in the Federal Government to administer is the War Assets Administration. A few days ago before a committee of the other body of Congress a witness made complimentary remarks on the efforts of the present Administrator.

I believe these remarks were unfair and unfounded. Personally I have the greatest admiration of Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, who at the request of the President of the United States, is working night and day to bring order out of the tangled mess he inherited when he reluctantly accepted appointment as War Assets Administrator.

General Gregory, who was the most able Quartermaster General in the history of our country, did not seek this job. He fills it now only because of his desire to be of service to his country. He was looking forward to his retirement when he was asked to lend his great administrative ability to this task.

Criticism of the way surplus property has been handled may be entirely justified on the basis of past performance, but certainly this criticism should not be directed against an Administrator who has been in charge only a very brief time. He officially took over just a little over 7 weeks ago and is making headway in his efforts to make a cumbersome machinery into a workable organization. We here in this House should recognize the fact that much of the blame for the snarl in surplus property disposal results from the many restraints placed upon the War Assets Administration by legislation we have enacted.

If there is anyone with the ability and the experience necessary to handle this situation, that man is General Gregory, and I do not believe he merits any of the unfair criticism directed his way.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include three editorials.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and as given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BULWINKLE (at the request of Mr. SPARKMAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by General Devers.

Mr. SPARKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement before the House Committee on Ways and Means by Mrs. Loula Dunn, president of the American Public Welfare Association.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. LeCOMPTÉ (at the request of Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa), for 1 week, on account of death in the family.

To Mr. FERNANDEZ, for a period beginning May 20 and ending June 5, on account of official business.

To Mr. CLASON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for 1 week, on account of illness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 20, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled a public hearing on the bill (H. R. 4307) to amend sections 81, 82, 83, and 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building, and will begin at 10 a. m. on Friday, May 24, 1946.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will begin hearings Tuesday, June 4, 1946, at 10 a. m., in the Patents Committee room, 416 House Office Building, on the following bills:

H. R. 3694 (Hartley): A bill to declare the national policy regarding the test for determining invention.

H. R. 5842 (Boykin): A bill fixing the date of the termination of World War II, for special purposes.

H. R. 5940 (Lanham): A bill to make Government-owned patents freely available for use by citizens of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

These hearings will be continued on succeeding days until concluded or until this notice is superseded.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1310. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to

amend the act providing for the appointment of court reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1311. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 8, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Mississippi River with a view to determining if additional improvement, including a small-boat harbor, is advisable at Hastings, Minn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, adopted on January 3, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 599); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1312. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1313. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of \$92,500,000, for the War Department, for cemetery expenses (H. Doc. No. 597); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1314. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$45,400 and a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 598); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 624. Resolution providing additional funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 2073). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6459. A bill to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2074). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 6477. A bill to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H. R. 6478. A bill to protect the people from interference with the movement of the mails and interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 6479. A bill to incorporate the Military Pilots Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 6480. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Malitch; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 6481. A bill for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 6482. A bill for the relief of Ralph A. Parker and Mrs. Hilda J. Parker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6483. A bill for the relief of Bernice Green; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TALBOT:

H. R. 6484. A bill for the relief of Helen M. Crowley; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1892. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of C. W. Brown, manager, Ennis Motor Co., Ennis, Tex., opposing exemption of copiers from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1893. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of members of the Winnebago Association of Congregational Churches, which met at Clintonville, Wis., on April 30, 1946, regarding their position on the present food situation and wide starvation existing in Europe and Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1894. Also, petition of members of the Winnebago Association of Congregational Churches, which met at Clintonville, Wis., on April 30, 1946, regarding their position on release of men and women with 18 months or more of service in the armed services; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1895. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Pontiac City Commission, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of Senate bill 1592; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1896. Also, petition of various Townsend Clubs in Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsing House bills 2229 and 2230; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 20, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Norman L. Trott, minister, First Methodist Church, Brunswick, Md., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in Heaven, we, Thy children of the earth, bow before Thee this morning.

As we bow our heads, may our hearts be bowed in gratitude for all Thy gifts and our wills be bent in submission to the wisdom of Thy way.

Be with our Nation, O God, in these days of testing.

Help us to know Thy will and to do it, that we may share in Thy plan for the